

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Score Key:	++ Significant Positive effect	+ Minor positive effect	0 No overall effect	- Minor negative effect	-- Significant negative effect	? Score uncertain
<p><i>NB: where more than one symbol is presented in a box it indicates that the SEA has found more than one score for the category. Where the scores are both positive and negative, the boxes are deliberately not coloured. Where a box is coloured but also contains a ?, this indicates uncertainty over whether the effect could be a minor or significant effect although a professional judgement is expressed in the colour used. A conclusion of uncertainty arises where there is insufficient evidence for expert judgement to conclude an effect..</i></p> <p><i>S – short term (less than 0.75 year), M – medium term (between 0.75 and 5 years) and L – long term (> 5 years)</i></p>						

RS Policy SP1: Sub-Regions in the South East

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>This policy sets out the sub regions which will be the focus for growth and regeneration in the South East. Co-ordinated effort across boundaries will be required to better align economic and housing growth, deliver adequate infrastructure in a timely manner and to plan for more sustainable forms of development.</p> <p>The requirement for cross boundary working to better align economic and housing growth, deliver infrastructure in a more timely manner and plan for sustainable development will help focus growth and help with regeneration in the sub regions (as outlined below).</p> <p>The policy provides the framework for the future growth of key sub-regions defined as:</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Hampshire • Sussex Coast • East Kent and Ashford • Kent Thames Gateway • London Fringe • Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley • Central Oxfordshire • Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale • Gatwick. <p>There would be significant positive effects on population and human health through efforts to better align economic and housing growth. There will also be minor positive effects on all the other environmental SEA topic areas through planning for more sustainable development.</p> <p>As noted in the Sustainability Appraisal of the South East Plan there are persistent pockets of deprivation across the South East in places such as the Sussex Coast and parts of the Kent Thames Gateway. The policy would help to regenerate these areas and more widely the South East as a whole. This will have significant positive effects on human health.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Whilst the NPPF is not regionally specific it does seek to promote sustainable development as a core planning principle and build a strong competitive economy. Local Planning Authorities are required through their Local Plans to 'set out a clear economic vision for their area which positively and proactively encourages economic growth' and to 'Identify priority areas for economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement'. This will help to regenerate deprived areas of the south east and to boost the economic performance of the region which will have significant positive effects on the population and human health.</p> <p>As the analysis of revocation of the sub-regional policies shows there will still be positive impacts if the policies for the sub regional areas are revoked because other measures will help to provide positive effects on the sub regions through the NPPF or other national legislation, for example the UK Sustainable Development Strategy.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None</p>

RS PolicySP2: Regional Hubs

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>This policy requires relevant Regional Strategies, Local Development Documents and Local Transport Plans to include policies and proposals that support and develop the role of regional hubs through various measures.</p> <p>This policy concerns the optimisation of the existing transport network with key opportunities to maximise more sustainable modes of transport through locational policies and the greater use of regional transport hubs.</p> <p>Retention of the policy would also help to encourage the use of public transport and walking and cycling. This will have significant positive impacts on population & human health and also air and climatic factors through a reduction in vehicle use and subsequent benefits in terms of greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>There are no other overall environmental impacts.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None required.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The NPPF (paragraph 21) requires local planning authorities to identify priority areas for</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement. The NPPF also promotes sustainable transport (section 4) and requires, where practical for new developments to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies; Give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities; Create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians, avoiding street clutter and where appropriate establishing home zones; Incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles; and Consider needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport. <p>The NPPF also requires that developments which generate significant movement are located where the need to travel can be minimised and use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised (paragraph 34) and states that transport solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion should be encouraged (paragraph 30).</p> <p>Reduction in emissions to air resulting from more sustainable transport will have a significant positive impact on air quality which will result in a significant positive impact on climate and human health. Measures which encourage walking and cycling will also have a positive impact on human health.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> None</p>

RS PolicySP3: Urban Focus and Urban Renaissance

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The prime focus for development in the South East is to be in urban areas, in order to foster accessibility to employment, housing, retail and other services and to avoid unnecessary travel. This policy sets out the criteria on which LPA policies are to be based.</p> <p>The policy seeks to concentrate development within, or adjacent to, existing settlements, minimise the effects of urban sprawl, loss of settlement distinctions and loss of greenfield land. In focusing development on previous developed land (PDL) there are clear significant environmental effects unless the PDL site has some biodiversity value.</p> <p>Focusing development will help to avoid the use of greenfield land and will have a positive impact on water, soil, biodiversity, flora and fauna. Intensification of development around transport hubs would have significant positive impacts on human health, air and climatic factors through increased use of sustainable modes of transport. Regeneration of the urban environment will have a positive impact on townscape. Development will require construction materials and have a negative impact on material assets. The impact on cultural heritage will be uncertain, dependent on the proximity of urban development to historic buildings.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Proximity of urban development to historic buildings and hence impact on cultural heritage.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF does set out in paragraph 17 the core planning principles which include encouraging the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. Paragraph 111 continues that planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. Paragraph 111 also states that local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land. However there is no specific target for use of brownfield land. Without a specific regional target there is the possibility that there could be a reduction in the amount of brownfield land which is re-used, which would provide an element of uncertainty to the impact on soil.</p> <p>However, the NPPF seeks to ensure the vitality of town centres, promotes sustainable transport, seeks to provide a wide choice of high quality housing and requires good design which is considered to be 'a key aspect of sustainable development'. The NPPF also seeks to promote healthy communities and protects the greenbelt, which will help to ensure that brownfield land is redeveloped.</p> <p>Paragraph 58 of the NPPF stipulates that 'planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that new developments will improve the character of areas, create and sustain a mix of uses, respond to local character and history, create safe and accessible environments, and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping'. These requirements will ensure positive impacts on biodiversity, soil, water and townscape. There will be a significant positive impact on population, air quality and climate, and an adverse impact on material assets. The impact on cultural heritage will be uncertain, dependent on the proximity of urban development to historic buildings.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As mentioned above, revocation of the policy removes a specific regional target for use of brownfield land. Whilst the NPPF encourages the use of brownfield land and local planning authorities may set local targets, the removal of the specific target could reduce the amount of brownfield land, which could have uncertain impacts in relation to the amount of brownfield development.</p> <p>Proximity of urban development to historic buildings and hence impact on cultural heritage.</p>

RS Policy SP4: Regeneration and Social Inclusion

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>Retention is likely to result in significant positive effects on population & human health through efforts to reduce inequality and encourage regeneration and investment.</p> <p>As stated in the Sustainability Appraisal of the South East Plan, community wellbeing has been monitored through a range of indicators. Dealing with an ageing population is highlighted as a key issue and health levels in the South East are above the national average.</p> <p>The South East and East of England have the lowest proportions of most deprived LSOA's (Lower layer Super Output Areas). However, there are still pockets of deprivation in the South East which need to be addressed, particularly in the Thames Gateway and East Kent areas. Targeting funding in these areas will have positive effects.</p> <p>There are no overall other environmental impacts.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>No mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Whilst there are efforts in this policy to reduce deprivation, there are other factors such as the economic climate which will have an impact on levels of deprivation and so this would provide a level of uncertainty in addressing social inequality/deprivation problems.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF seeks to promote healthy communities, involve communities in planning policies and decisions, to plan positively to ensure that local communities are well provided with social, recreational and cultural facilities. This will have positive impacts on human health which would help to reduce deprivation across parts of the South East.</p> <p>Tackling health problems will help to reduce the pockets of deprivation which exist across the South East, and together with efforts in the NPPF to regenerate existing communities there will be significant positive effects on population and human health.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The current economic climate may impact upon the ability to address socio-economic deprivation across the South East of England.</p>

RS Policy SP5: Green Belts

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that the existing extent of Green Belt in region is appropriate and will be retained and supported and the opportunity should be taken to improve its land-use management and access as part of initiatives to improve rural urban fringe. Selective reviews of the green belt are required to allow development in sustainable locations.</p> <p>Protection and positive management of the Green Belt will have significant positive impacts on biodiversity and landscape. Improvement in land use management should improve soil and water quality. There may also be improvement in air quality as the green space provides a carbon sink, with consequential positive impact on climate. Retention and enhancement of Green Belt and the urban fringe will provide incentive for recreational activities which will have a significant positive impact on human health.</p> <p>Some green belt review would be required under the policy to permit development in sustainable locations, which could offset some of the benefits of green belt protection (see above). However, the scale of the green belt releases in Oxford are quite limited (and are considered in more detail under the assessment of CO4) and a green belt review for Guildford has been ruled out following a high court challenge. Any boundary reviews that are undertaken would take into consideration the potential adverse environmental impacts. Consequently the overall positive impact on biodiversity and landscape is considered to be significant.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
																											natural environment. <u>Assumptions</u> None. <u>Uncertainty</u> None.	
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u> The NPPF seeks to protect the Green Belt (section 9) and establishes that the fundamental aim of the green belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The NPPF states that once Green Belts have been defined 'local authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the green belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity, or to improve damaged and derelict land.' The NPPF paragraphs 79 – 92 relate to protecting green belt land. The Green Belt boundaries should be established in Local Plans and only altered in exceptional circumstances. Furthermore, paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development; not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open; where necessary, identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and • define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. <p>Given these provisions in the NPPF, it is likely that the benefits from retaining the existing Green Belt will be retained. Enhancement of green belt land would also have a significant positive impact on biodiversity and landscape, and a positive impact on soil and water quality. Provision of opportunities for outdoor recreation will have a significant positive impact on human health. Air quality and climate would benefit from an increase in carbon storage resulting from improved soil management.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> None.</p>

RS Policy CC1: Sustainable Development

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The principal objective of the Plan is to achieve and maintain sustainable development in the region. The policy sets out sustainable development priorities for the South East.</p> <p>Sustainable development, as reflected in the policy will in itself have inherently positive impacts across the full spectrum of SEA topics. Seeking to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, to ensure that the South East is prepared for the inevitable impacts of climate change and to achieve safe, secure and socially inclusive communities across the region will also have significant positive effects on population and climatic factors.</p> <p>The amount of development proposed for the South East region would have impacts upon climate change. However, this policy, together with measures in Policy CC2 will help significantly to mitigate the impacts of new development.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The scale of the effects will depend on the quantum, nature and location of development across the region over the South East Plan period and beyond.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>As paragraph 6 of the NPPF makes clear, the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. It makes specific reference to the five 'guiding principles' of sustainable development set out in the UK Sustainable Development: <i>Strategy Securing the Future</i>. These are: living within the planet's environmental limits; ensuring a strong, healthy and just society; achieving a sustainable economy; promoting good governance; and using sound science responsibly. The policies in paragraphs 18 to 219, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system.</p> <p>The revocation of this policy would not remove the requirement for local plans to be consistent with legal and national policy requirements on climate change: including supporting the move to a low carbon future and avoiding increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. There should therefore be the same significant positive effects on climatic factors and humans as would be the case if the policy was retained and a positive impact on the other environmental aspects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>It is assumed that local planning authorities will operate in accordance with their statutory duties on sustainable development and climate change in plan-making and to meet air and water quality standards, to afford the appropriate level of protection to designated sites and species. It is also assumed that they have due regard to the policies in the NPPF in plan making and development management decisions.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>No uncertainty.</p>

RS Policy CC2: Climate Change

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that measures to mitigate and adapt to current and forecast effects of climate change will be implemented through application of local planning policy and other mechanisms. The policy also identifies that behavioural change will be essential in implementing this policy and measures identified.</p> <p>Although the South East has the highest levels of CO₂ emissions after London, overall levels of carbon emissions declined between 2005 and 2009.</p> <p>By aiming to reduce carbon emissions, the policy will have a positive impact on air quality and a significant positive impact on climatic factors. The improved air quality will have a positive impact on biodiversity. The combination of improved air quality and reduced risk from climate change will have a significant positive impact on population and human health. Also, when this policy is considered in the context of the wider South East Plan, for example in conjunction with the efforts to promote sustainable forms of transport and generation of energy from renewable sources, there are significant efforts to mitigate impacts on climate change.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Success in mitigating the effects of climate change will require behavioural changes by individuals and organisations.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation is unlikely to affect the benefits identified above. One of the 12 core principles of planning set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF is to support the transition to a low carbon future, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change, and encourage the reuse of existing resources, including conversion of existing buildings, and encourage the use of renewable resources (for example, by the development of renewable energy).</p> <p>Paragraph 94 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change in line with the provisions of the Climate Change Act 2008.</p> <p>Paragraph 95 of the NPPF seeks to support the move to a low carbon future, by stating that local planning authorities should plan for new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions; actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings; and when setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, do so in a way consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards. Specifically, local planning authorities are expected to identify opportunities where development can draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supplies (paragraph 97).</p> <p>There is also other legislation, for example the EU Renewables Directive, which will help to reduce carbon emissions and have positive impacts on climate change. Additionally the Code for Sustainable Homes and the UK Carbon Plan 2011 will also have a positive impact on carbon reduction, together with associated environmental benefits.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainty Success in mitigating the effects of climate change will require behavioural changes by individuals and organisations.</p>

RS Policy CC3: Resource Use

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that a sustained programme of action to help stabilise the South East's ecological footprint by 2016 and reduce it by 2026 should be incorporated into plans and programmes.</p> <p>There would be significant positive impacts through increased efficiency of resource use, to adapt existing developments to use fewer resources and to bring about changes in behaviour by organisations and individuals. The overall approach of this policy would help to see fewer natural resources used across the South East, which would have positive effects on biodiversity, population, soil, water, air and climatic factors and also on landscape. More efficient resource use will conserve material assets resulting in a minor positive impact.</p> <p>There would no overall effects on cultural heritage.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>No mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Changes in resource use would require, amongst other measures changes in behaviour by organisations/individuals, which is uncertain and success would depend upon this.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 established that the purpose of planning was to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF sets out the Government framework for achieving sustainable development in England. Core planning principles embodied in the NPPF include the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment and the reuse of existing resources. The NPPF also seeks to move towards a low carbon economy which will help with resource use.</p> <p>The NPPF also requires new development to <i>'take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing landscaping to minimise energy consumption'</i> and that Local Authorities should have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources.</p> <p>There is additional legislation which will have an impact upon resource use, including the Renewables Directive, which mandates levels of renewable energy use in the EU, the Landfill Directive, which will help to encourage recycling and the Code for Sustainable Homes, which sets national standards for sustainable design and construction of new homes. This code also aims to reduce carbon emissions and create more sustainable homes.</p> <p>Taking the statement in the NPPF of a presumption in favour of sustainable development and the policies as a whole, including the specific measures identified above, there will be similar positive impacts on environmental aspects following revocation of the policy.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>No mitigation.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Changes in resource use would require, amongst other measures, changes in behaviour by organisations/individuals, which is uncertain and success would depend upon this.</p>

RS Policy CC4: Sustainable Design and Construction

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires design and construction of all new development, and the redevelopment and refurbishment of existing building stock will be expected to adopt and incorporate sustainable construction standards and techniques. The Policy sets out the sustainable construction standards and techniques that should be followed.</p> <p>The policy requires Local Planning Authorities to promote best practice in sustainable construction and help to achieve national timetable for carbon emissions for residential and non-residential development.</p> <p>There will be positive effects on population & human health, water, air & climatic factors through implementation of the sustainable construction standards/techniques set out in this policy. These techniques will help to reduce water and energy use and have positive effects on air and climatic factors through reduced carbon emissions and for a proportion of energy to come from decentralised and renewable/low carbon sources.</p> <p>Given the amount of development proposed in the South East it will be critically important to limit the environmental impacts of the new development proposed. The Sustainability Appraisal undertaken of the South East Plan highlighted that there may still not be enough new homes being provided and so an even greater amount of housing could be required which would further highlight the importance of implementing this policy. The Sustainability Appraisal also suggested that, overall, the South East Plan was likely to have negative impacts on climate change, so incorporating the measures in this policy into existing buildings, and also for new development will help to limit climate change.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>There are no overall impacts on biodiversity, soils , cultural heritage and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures No mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainty The success of this policy would depend to some extent on behavioural changes by organisations and individuals to ensure implementation of the sustainable construction design/techniques.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>There are measures in the NPPF to ensure that the challenge of climate change is met which includes seeking to move to a low carbon future and that local planning authorities should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actively support energy efficiency to existing improvements; and When setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, do so in a way consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards. <p>Also, the NPPF expects new development to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comply with adopted Local Plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply, unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that it is not feasible or viable; and Take account of landform, layout, building orientation massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption. <p>The NPPF also places responsibility on all communities to help increase use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy development.</p> <p>All of these measures in the NPPF will help to ensure new developments are sustainably</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>designed and constructed, which would have positive effects on population, air and climatic factors. The requirement in the NPPF for Local Planning Authorities to support energy efficiency improvements for existing buildings will also have positive impacts.</p> <p>In addition to the NPPF, the Code for Sustainable Homes sets a national standard for the sustainable design and construction of new homes. The code aims to reduce our carbon emissions and ensure that new homes are more sustainable. There are also local level planning documents for a number of the Local Authorities across the South East, such as Supplementary Planning Documents which have specific standards for sustainable design and construction.</p> <p>The overall effects are the same as for retention of the RS policy.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The measures in the NPPF would require behavioural changes from organisations/individuals in order to move to a low carbon economy for example and so success would depend to some extent on this.</p>

RS Policy CC5: Supporting An Ageing Population

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy sets out what policies and programmes need to address in respect of supporting an ageing population.</p> <p>There would be significant positive impacts for population and human health through the measures in this policy. The policy would help to provide the care and services that an ageing population will need.</p> <p>Managing the impacts of an ageing population will be particularly important for the South East, which has and will continue to have an ageing population. Supporting the ageing population was highlighted in the Sustainability Appraisal of the South East RSS as a key issue and so the efforts in this policy will help to address this key issue.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainty None.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF seeks to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes and to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends... and the needs of different groups</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>in the community such as older people (para. 50). It also seeks to ensure that housing provided reflects local demand and to takes into consideration future demand for housing. This will undoubtedly involve catering for the elderly given the ageing population of the South East. The NPPF also seeks to promote healthy communities, to deliver social, recreational and cultural facilities the community needs and to protect existing sports and recreation facilities. Seven Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP) have been established in the South East region and one of their functions is to enable the improvement of skills provision to match the requirements of economic development.</p> <p>The NPPF framework, combined with the activities of the LEPs, will provide a similar level of support to the ageing population as provided for within the South East, and consequently a significant positive benefit to the population and human health.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> None</p>

RS Policy CC6: Sustainable Communities and Character of the Environment

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires that actions and decisions associated with the development and use of land will actively promote the creation of sustainable and distinctive communities. This will be achieved by developing and implementing a local shared vision.</p> <p>The policy will have a significant positive impact on population and positive impacts across all of the SEA subject areas through the various measures in this policy. Such an approach will also help with regeneration of deprived areas across the South East.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. There are also other measures in the NPPF to ensure development of sustainable communities, for example by providing a wide choice of high quality housing to meet needs of present and future generations, providing accessible local services that reflect communities needs. The NPPF also seeks to protect and enhance the natural and built environment and requires good</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>design as part of all new developments.</p> <p>Taking the policies of the NPPF as a whole there will be a significant positive impact on population from the creation of sustainable communities, and positive impacts on other environmental aspects.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None.</p>

RS Policy: Policy CC7 Infrastructure and Implementation

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that the scale and pace of development will depend on sufficient capacity being available in existing infrastructure to meet the needs of development. If this cannot be demonstrated, the scale and pace of development will depend on additional capacity with infrastructure being released through demand management/better management of existing infrastructure, or through provision of new infrastructure. Where new development creates a need for additional infrastructure, a programme of delivery should be agreed before development begins.</p> <p>The provision of infrastructure to meet the development needs of the South East will be critical to the delivery of the development proposed by the plan. Agreeing a programme of delivery of funding, together with the measures set out to achieve funding for delivery of infrastructure, will have significant positive effects on population and human health.</p> <p>The extent of new infrastructure required is not confirmed and consequently impacts on the environment are otherwise uncertain as provision and delivery of infrastructure could impact adversely on the environment without appropriate mitigation/safeguards in place.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Assumes that Local Government and private sector partners, together with Central</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															Government, will work together to ensure that funding for infrastructure is in place. Uncertainty Scale and location of new infrastructure required, together with funding.
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Likely Significant Effects of Revocation Local Planning Authorities are required through the NPPF to take into consideration in drawing up Local Plans the need to identify areas for infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement. Identifying areas for infrastructure provision will help with economic growth which will boost the economic performance of the South East and have significant positive effects on population and human health. The NPPF states that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites for employment where there is no reasonable prospect of the sites being used for that purpose and that land allocations should be regularly reviewed. If a site cannot reasonably be expected to be developed for economic uses, other uses for the site should be considered on their merits. This approach may allow undeveloped sites to be brought forward for development for infrastructure provision, which would again have positive impacts for population and human health However, given that there are uncertainties over the location and scale of infrastructure that would be needed, the consequential environmental effects are also uncertain. Mitigation Measures None. Assumptions None. Uncertainty Scale and location of new infrastructure required, together with funding.

RS Policy CC8: Green Infrastructure

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires local authorities and partners to work together to plan, provide and manage connected and substantial networks of accessible multi-functional green space.</p> <p>Provision of green infrastructure will have wide ranging significant positive effects, particularly on biodiversity, flora and fauna, human health, soils and landscape as the policy will help to protect green space and provide areas of new space as part of green infrastructure provision. Protection and management of greenfield land will also, by improving soil function, result in improved carbon retention and water quality. Carbon retention would have a positive impact on air quality and climatic factors.</p> <p>As noted in the Sustainability Appraisal, the South East Plan is likely to lead to negative overall impacts on climate change given that its remit is to set a context for development (notably of housing) but does not allow it to control the developments' air pollution and climate change impacts. This policy will help communities become more resilient to the effects of climate change. This policy will have a positive impact on climatic factors.</p> <p>There are no overall effects on material assets or cultural heritage.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that Local Authorities and partners would work together to achieve positive outcomes with regard to development of green infrastructure.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
																											<p>Uncertainty None.</p>	
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment. Paragraph 114 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should <i>‘set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure’.</i></p> <p>However, paragraph 117 goes further stating that planning policies should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries; • identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation; • promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan; • aim to prevent harm to geological conservation interests; and • where Nature Improvement Areas are identified in Local Plans, consider specifying the types of development that may be appropriate in these Areas. <p>The plan policies are supported by the development management requirements set out in paragraph 118.</p> <p>Paragraph 99 of the NPPF notes that planning for green infrastructure can be a suitable adaptation measure to managing risks, including flood risks, arising when new development is brought forward in areas vulnerable to climate change impacts</p> <p>In addition, the introduction of Local Nature Partnerships announced in the Natural</p>	

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Environment White Paper which will complement existing local partnerships (which deal with matters such as provision of green infrastructure) will improve the chances of the delivery of the policy. Such partnerships will be able to work across administrative boundaries to enable planning of networks at the scale that has the most impact.</p> <p>The NPPF also seeks to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and to combat the adverse impacts of climate change. At an overarching level sustainable development is at the heart of the NPPF and together with efforts to conserve and enhance the local/natural environment and to plan positively for green infrastructure, a similar scale of significant positive impacts is predicted for biodiversity, population, soil and landscape. Improved soil quality will have a positive impact on water quality, carbon retention, air quality and climatic factors.</p> <p>There will be no overall effects on material assets and cultural heritage.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> It is assumed that Local Authorities will plan positively for creation of green infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> None.</p>

RS Policy CC9: Use of Public Land

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that, in order to identify potential development and land management opportunities, Government departments and public landowners should undertake strategic reviews of their land holdings, taking into account the objectives and policies of the Plan as a primary consideration in the use and disposal of their land. They should consult the regional planning body and other partners on the disposal and development of major sites, paying particular attention to the need to bring forward land for housing, especially affordable housing.</p> <p>Government departments and public landowners undertaking reviews of their land holdings will help to ensure the redevelopment of brownfield land which would have positive impacts on the landscape and avoid use of greenfield land for development.</p> <p>However, this is a complex issue. Land holdings can be a mixture of hard standing and green space, for example aerodromes and airfields in particular have green space and this may have some biodiversity value. More importantly, the South East Plan would not necessarily be the key document for public bodies - for example, the MOD estate rationalisation is driven by a strategic defence review and the Crichel Down Rules which provide the arrangements for Government acquired land (under compulsory purchase) to be offered back to former owners.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal undertaken of the South East Plan notes that the South East is one of the most built-up regions in England, with 15-20% of its land being built up areas and gardens, and it faces significant further development pressures. Efficient land use is thus an important consideration in regional and local planning.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal also notes that more land changes from non-residential to residential use in the South East than in any other region: the region accounts for about one-</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>fifth of all of the land use change to residential use in England. This is partly due to the large amount of house-building that has taken place in the region and partly due to the relatively low development densities in the South East. Although the average density of new dwellings in the region has increased over time, it is still below the national average.</p> <p>The re-use of as much public land as possible will help to ensure that land in the South East is used as efficiently as possible, especially in light of the development pressures and need for new housing.</p> <p>As the policy pays particular attention to the need to bring forward housing and especially affordable housing, there will be significant positive effects on population and human health.</p> <p>The disposal and development of major sites could have adverse impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets and cultural heritage without appropriate mitigation/safeguards in place and so impacts are uncertain (though it is noted that there are other policies in the plan which seek to protect biodiversity, combat the effects of climate change, and protect the historic environment).</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (e.g. CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Assumes that government departments and public landowners will work together to review land holdings and to work together with Local Planning Authorities with regard to the disposal of any land holdings and that there would be consultation with the Regional Planning Body in order to deliver positive outcomes.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Whilst the South East Plan can set policies to help ensure that public land is used and re-used and brought forward, economic conditions will have a big impact on this, particularly upon the housing market and affordable housing. The extent to which major sites will come forward for redevelopment is uncertain, and there is consequently an underlying uncertainty with respect to the degree and timing of adverse impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, air, material assets and</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															cultural heritage.
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not affect the decisions taken by public bodies regarding land holdings which, under current policies, already commit them to review their estate. Any decisions to redevelop will be subject to the requirements of relevant local plans (which would be developed in accordance with the NPPF).</p> <p>The NPPF does not direct government departments and public landowners to undertake a review of their landholdings. However, the core planning principles in paragraph 17 of the NPPF include encouraging the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (provided that not of high environmental value). Another of the principles is to 'encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can perform many functions (such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation...'</p> <p>With regard to affordable housing, the NPPF states that Local Authorities should, where they have identified that affordable housing is needed,</p> <p><i>'Set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. Such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time.'</i></p> <p>Encouraging the effective re-use of land and the efforts to address the problem of affordable housing will have a significant positive impact on population and will also benefit landscape.</p> <p>The disposal and development of major sites could have adverse impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets and cultural heritage without appropriate mitigation/safeguards in place and so impacts are uncertain (although policies within the NPPF seek to protect biodiversity, combat the effects of climate change, and protect the historic environment).</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainty Economic conditions will have a big impact on the rate at which public land is brought forward for development leading to uncertainty regarding the degree and timing of adverse impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets and cultural heritage.</p>

RS Policy RE1: Contributing to the UK's Long Term Competitiveness

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy establishes that the regional planning body and the regional development agency (SEEDA) will work with local authorities and business to ensure that spatial requirements for market flexibility are fully met, respecting the principles of sustainable development.</p> <p>This policy seeks to ensure that the region responds in a strategic way to the potential for economic growth arising from globalisation. Co-operation will be required with regional partners in order to ensure that account is taken of cross-boundary implications.</p> <p>The globalisation theme tracks the Regional Economic Strategy (RES) which identifies Global Competitiveness as one of the three overarching objectives of the South East plan.</p> <p>The objective of policy RE1 is to have a positive significant impact on the economy which would also have a significant positive impact on population.</p> <p>Economic growth will be accompanied by an increase in development. Provision of additional land for employment and housing, together with improved infrastructure will potentially have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape. There may also be an adverse impact on cultural heritage dependent on the proximity of development to sites of archaeological or historical importance.</p> <p>Within the region there is pressure on water resources. Additional development associated with economic regeneration would have a significant adverse impact on water.</p> <p>The development required to ensure this economic growth will involve use of construction materials which will have a significant adverse impact on material assets. It is probable that the development would also increase traffic movements which would increase emissions to air</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>and have a negative impact on air quality and climate.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Application of the principles of 'sustainable development', as required by the policy, combined with policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainty None.</p>
Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-				<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The regional planning body and regional development agency (SEEDA) have been abolished. One of the principal activities of SEEDA was 'to further the economic development and the regeneration of the South East'. A number of SEEDA's functions have been transferred to successor bodies. These have included: Inward Investment activities (PA Consulting, industry partner for UK Trade and Industry) and management of the European Regional Development Fund (Department for Communities and Local Government). In addition SEEDA has transferred economic intelligence resources to South East England Councils (SEEC). Seven Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP) have been established with the objective of enabling strategic business growth in the region.</p> <p>In revising Local Plans, local planning authorities will need to ensure policies are in accordance with the NPPF. One of the key planning principles set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF is to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs.</p> <p>Paragraphs 18-22 deal with building a strong, competitive economy. Paragraph 158 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that Local Plans are based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic characteristics and prospects of the area. In addition Local</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	<p>authorities are required to co-operate across administrative boundaries on planning issues.</p> <p>The objective of the revised structure is to deliver strategic economic development in the region and it is anticipated that a similar level of economic development will be achieved although there could be delays in implementation due to the need for all local authorities to have up to date Local Plans. This delay is unlikely to be significant in the medium to long term. The environmental effects identified with retention would also be likely following revocation.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> NPPF policies relating to sustainable development.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> Extent of delay in strategic function, and subsequent delays to plans.</p>

RS Policy RE2: Supporting Nationally and Regionally Important Sectors and Clusters

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires collaboration between local authorities, local strategic and economic partnerships, SEEDA and the business community to develop nationally and regionally important sectors and clusters (e.g. digital media; marine technologies; health technologies; aerospace and defence). A culture of innovation is to be encouraged and local plans are to ensure that land is made available, and that local assets can facilitate development of the sectors/clusters.</p> <p>Similar objectives are stated in the Regional Economic Strategy (RES) which aims to increase the percentage of business turnover in the South East attributable to improved products and services (section 3). At 3.1 it aims to support the development of a number of key sector consortia (including Marine South East; Envirobusiness South East and Farnborough Aerospace Consortium) and at 3.4 to develop, support and consolidate the Regional Enterprise Hub Network.</p> <p>Developments of this type require a high skills base and can potentially make a significant positive impact on economic development, and on the wider population</p> <p>Such development would be based on existing brownfield land, but will require additional land take. This would have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape, and could also have an adverse impact on cultural heritage although this is uncertain and dependent on the relative location of sites of historic/archaeological importance. Construction of facilities and infrastructure would have an adverse impact on material assets. Location of employment within hubs is likely to generate higher levels of traffic which would increase emissions to air and have an adverse impact on air quality and climate.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Water usage, together with the requirement for waste water treatment, will be sector dependent. The impact on water is uncertain.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies within the Core Strategy relating to sustainability and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainty Requirements for water and for waste water treatment will depend on actual development although it is noted that the sectors combine those with low and medium water usage.. Impacts on cultural heritage due to uncertainties on location of proposed development relative to the location of sites of historic/archaeological importance.</p>
Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The regional development agency (SEEDA) has been abolished.</p> <p>Seven Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP) have been established with the objective of enabling strategic business growth in the region. Several of these comment specifically on strategic sectors. The Solent LEP states '<i>Our focus has been developing strategic sectors and clusters (interconnected groups and businesses) of marine, aero and defence, advanced manufacturing, engineering, transport and logistics businesses</i>'. The stated aims of the coast2capital LEP include: '<i>Stimulating business growth, innovation, productivity and employment across a range of key sectors, bringing GVA and employment growth overall up to a least the regional average</i>'.</p> <p>In addition three Enterprise Zones have been established in the region: Discovery Park (Sandwich); Science Vale (Harwell, Oxford) and Solent Enterprise Zone (Gosport). These are hubs for specialist high technology development including pharmaceuticals, green technology;</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>aerospace transport and bio-technology. Stimulants to growth in these zones include tax breaks, high speed broadband infrastructure, and lower levels of planning controls.</p> <p>In revising Local Plans, local planning authorities will need to ensure policies are in accordance with the NPPF. One of the core principles in paragraph 17 of the NPPF is that the planning system should 'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs'. Section 1 of the NPPF provides guidance on building a strong, competitive economy. There is a requirement on local authorities to 'plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries'.</p> <p>The framework provided by the NPPF policies, together with the duty to co-operate across administrative boundaries means that local authorities should continue to support growth in the type of development identified in the RS policy. Investment has already been committed to initiate hubs in the region. The likely impacts associated with retention would also be likely following revocation.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Extent of delay in change in administrative arrangements (SEEDA abolition and take up by LEPs) and any delays to revisions to local plans will affect development. Requirements for water and for waste water treatment by new development and impact on cultural heritage.</p>

RS Policy RE3: Employment and Land Provision

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires local authorities to undertake employment land reviews, preferably in conjunction with housing reviews. The review should consider potential for development of sites with existing permission, and where this appears unlikely, alternative allocations should be made. These reviews are to be undertaken in consultation with adjoining authorities and business and should identify strategic employment land. The policy requires that accessible and well-located industrial/commercial sites should be retained where there is a good prospect of employment use. Indicative job figures are provided for each sub-region.</p> <p>The strategic provision of employment land will contribute to economic growth, and have a significant positive impact on population. This is reflected in the intent to create 480,000 jobs by 2026, although it is noted that these figures are indicative.</p> <p>Construction associated with the development of employment land, and associated housing provision, will have a significant adverse impact on material assets. Increased employment will generate higher water demand and have a significant negative impact on water resources.</p> <p>The policy requires that allocations should be focussed on urban areas and that they should make efficient use of existing and underused sites. This would have the effect of reducing the extent of land take associated with development. However it is envisaged that there will be some requirement for development on green field land, and an associated adverse impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape is predicted. There may also be an adverse impact on cultural heritage, dependent on the relative location of sites of historic/archaeological importance.</p> <p>The policy also requires that allocations should be in locations that are, or will be, accessible to the existing/proposed labour supply, and that promote the use of public transport. The</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>combined effect of proximity of labour and use of public transport would reduce the potential adverse impact on air quality and climate. The extent to which these provisions would reduce impact on air quality and climate is uncertain.</p> <p>The policy requires reviews to be carried out which could lead to some delay in implementation at a local level.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies within the Core Strategy relating to sustainability and protection of the environment (e.g.CC1).</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Effectiveness of intention to promote public transport in protecting air quality and climate.</p>
Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-				<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>This policy on the provision of land for employment has been examined in all adopted local plans and/or core strategies in the South East region. This analysis shows that the indicative targets for net growth in jobs are reflected in the 21 local plans or core strategies adopted after the adoption of the South East Plan, or just before the South East Plan was adopted. These plans and core strategies also contain policies that allocate land for employment and, in some cases, set out details of allocations of floor space for buildings required for different types of employment. In the short term, (i.e. including day one of revocation of the regional strategy) there will be no impact of removing the South East policy in these authorities.</p> <p>The other 47 authorities are at varying stages in the preparation of updated plans.</p> <p>The majority allocate land for employment although there may be no link to the number of jobs they are intended to support. For these authorities the short term impact is more difficult to determine.</p> <p>Revocation will not be likely to affect the ongoing delivery of the intent of this policy, although</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>there is likely to be a temporary period when those authorities without an updated and adopted plan, develop a Local Plan which takes into account the NPPF. For the first twelve months (from 27 March 2012) decision-makers may continue to give full weight to relevant policies adopted since 2004 (in development plan documents adopted in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004), even if there is a limited degree of conflict with the Framework. Beyond March 2013 plans and decisions will need to be consistent with the NPPF including its policies on employment land and the creation of jobs, the local plan and other material considerations.</p> <p>The NPPF requires local planning authorities to set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area and to set criteria, or identify sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and meet anticipated needs (paragraph 21). In addition, planning authorities should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose (paragraph 22). These sites may be appropriate for other uses, subject to the merits of the proposals. Land allocations are to be regularly reviewed.</p> <p>One of the key planning principles set out in the NPPF is to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. However, this should be in accordance with other policies in the NPPF which seek to minimise environmental effects. This includes minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains where possible (paragraph 109) having access to high quality public transport facilities (paragraph 35) and aiming for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities (paragraph 37). This is likely to provide similar significant benefits as retention of the plan in the longer term.</p> <p>Revocation is likely to have significant negative effects on the water resources of the region. The minor and significant negative environmental effects identified with retention would also be likely to occur following revocation.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Orange	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies (as above) throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>There will be uncertainties across all of the factors because the precise location of future employment development is unknown at this stage.</p> <p>Depending on the location of employment relative to the homes of the workforce and decisions taken on the mode of travel to work there will be uncertainties in relation to air quality and climatic factors. The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short and early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery may be lower that provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects may be less.</p> <p>The effects will also be dependent on the economy and the ability to attract businesses to the area.</p>

RS Policy RE4: Human Resource Development

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires that local authorities should work with business, education and training providers to ensure that skills provision meets the requirements of business. This involves a central role for the Regional Skills for Productivity Alliance (RSPA). The combination of addressing skill shortages, improving skills and providing additional educational facilities will have a positive impact on economic potential in the region and on the population.</p> <p>The requirement for facilities and premises may require additional land take which would have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape. There may also be additional traffic generation which would cause aerial emissions and have a negative impact on air quality and climate. However the scale of development, while unknown, is unlikely to be high and any associated adverse environmental impacts are likely to be insignificant.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>See policies RE1, RE2 and RE3 for indirect effects associated with increased economic development</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Negligible scale of greenfield land take for development. Negligible impact on traffic generation.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The scale of additional development to realise this policy is uncertain, however, as per the assumption, is unlikely to be high and any associated adverse environmental impacts are likely to be insignificant.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Regional Assemblies have been abolished and RSPA has ceased to exist. Seven LEPs have been established in the region to stimulate economic development. A core activity of the LEPs is to provide an enabling role in skills development to meet the existing and future needs of the business sector.</p> <p>This will have a positive impact on economic development and the local population.</p> <p>There is no significant difference in the aspirations for skills enhancement following revocation of the RS. No significant direct impacts are predicted on biodiversity, soil, water, air, climate, material assets, cultural heritage or landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Negligible scale of greenfield landtake for development. Negligible impact on traffic generation.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As for retention.</p>

RS Policy RE5: Smart Growth

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The intention of the policy is to achieve 'smart ' economic growth while reducing its ecological footprint. This would be achieved by enabling businesses to work efficiently through consideration of needs for land and premises, movement, housing and ICT.</p> <p>Achieving 'smart growth' in order to lift underperformance is one of the three core objectives of the Regional Economic Strategy.</p> <p>Achievement of smart economic growth would contribute to improved economic performance and have a positive impact on the population. Achievement of the policy objectives would reduce the requirement for employment land which would have positive impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape. Better use of existing space would reduce the need for material assets resulting in a positive impact. A lower reliance on transport, or better use of public transport, would have a positive impact on air quality and climate. The impact on cultural heritage would be neutral.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Successful implementation of the policy would mitigate the potential impacts of economic development (policies RE1, RE2 and RE3).</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty None.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation Seven Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP) have been established in the region with the objective of enabling strategic business growth in the region. The NPPF seeks to achieve sustainable development. In particular the NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment and to facilitate the sustainable use of minerals. The NPPF also seeks to move towards a low carbon economy which will contribute towards resource use. The NPPF promotes sustainable transport (section 4) and local authorities are required to support the expansion of electronic communications networks (section 5, para. 43), including high speed broadband, an essential element of 'smart' economic growth. Implementation of these, and other, requirements of the NPPF would have the same impacts as retention of the RS. Mitigation Measures None. Assumptions None. Uncertainty None.</p>

RS Policy RE6: Competitiveness and Addressing Structural Economic Weakness

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>In acknowledgement of the differences in economic performance within the region this policy identifies the actions to be taken in areas of strong and weak performance. In the strongest areas there is an emphasis on 'smart' growth and the use of ICT to stimulate remote working. In the coastal belt, where the economy is less successful, actions are focused on land allocation, skills enhancement and improved transport. SEEDA has a role working with local authorities and other authorities to unlock sites with economic potential, and to optimise economic potential of the 'international gateways'.</p> <p>The Regional Economic Strategy (RES) identifies three broad economic contours in the region, each with their own challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Inner South East which has world class economic performance and requires investment to secure ongoing performance in a global economy; the Rural South East which requires investment to assist some areas of deprivation and to assist remote working in rural locations; and the Coastal South East which has seen continued social decline where investment is needed to improve <i>inter alia</i> skills, innovation and creativity. <p>Policies throughout the RES relating to the 'Global Challenge' and 'Smart Growth' seek to address the challenges provided by the regional differences in economic performance.</p> <p>The impact of this policy is to support the economic development proposed within the plan. This will have a significant positive impact on economic potential, and the region's population. However the scale of new development involved would have significant negative effects on</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>water and material assets. Land take associated with development would have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and landscape. Increased traffic generated by new development is likely to have a negative impact on air quality and climate although the longer term impact will depend on the outcome of improved transport required in the policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The indirect impacts associated with the policy are those related to the identification and development of industrial/commercial sites to support the economic development (policy RE3).</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Improvement in transport, together with 'smart working' and higher use of ICT, are important considerations in this policy. The net effects on air quality and climate are negative in the short and early medium term, but more uncertain in the medium to longer term, dependent on the detail of any improvements to transport, and reductions in private travel arising from the policy.</p>
Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>SEEDA has been abolished and 7 regionally focussed LEPs established within the region to enable economic development, including enhancement of the skills base. Actions for each LEP will be targeted towards requirements of the prevailing local economy. Local authorities are under a duty to co-operate with other bodies, including LEPs, providing a mechanism for incorporating planning requirements into local development documents.</p> <p>The impacts identified with retention would also be likely following revocation i.e. that there would be the economic development proposed within the plan and this will have a significant positive impact on economic potential, and the region's population. Also the scale of new development involved would have significant negative effects on water and material assets.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures None.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainty Smart working is a theme which is being taken forward by the LEPs, together with increased use of ICT. As for retention of the policy, there are uncertainties in the medium to long term regarding impacts on air quality and climate, dependent on transport infrastructure provision and impacts on private travel.</p>

RS Policy H1: Regional Housing Provision 2006 – 2026

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy sets out the regional housing provision for 2006-2026. It requires Local Authorities to allocate sufficient land and facilitate the delivery of 654,000 net additional dwellings and to work collaboratively to facilitate the delivery of the extra net additional dwellings identified in the policy for the sub regions and the rest of sub regional areas. Although the policy initially included provision of 8,440 dwellings in Guildford, the housing requirement for Guildford was subject to successful legal challenge and struck out.</p> <p>The increased provision of housing is likely to lead to significant positive effects on the population and human health. However, this will also depend on related factors such as the quality of the houses, their density, location relative to green spaces and ambient air quality.</p> <p>This policy will help to regenerate cities, towns and villages across the South East through the provision of new housing, which will help to make these places more sustainable areas to live and work.</p> <p>The policies are likely to have significant negative effects on the water resources of the region. The Sustainability Appraisal undertaken of the South East Plan highlighted the need (pending detailed feedback from the Environment Agency) to review housing allocations in the following districts due to water resource constraints: Canterbury, Crawley/Gatwick, Havant, Isle of Wight, Maidstone, Medway, Mid Sussex, Milton Keynes, Portsmouth, Reigate and Bansted, Test Valley. Water provision at Medway and South Hampshire was identified as being particularly problematic.</p> <p>The demand for construction materials and energy is likely to increase, as is traffic in the region. These are likely to have negative impacts on material assets, air quality and climatic</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>factors with the effects on material assets being significant.</p> <p>The housing allocations could potentially have negative impacts on historic town centres in some of the sub regions in the South East.</p> <p>The scale of development will have a significant impact on the character of the affected areas, and the land take required for development will have a negative impact upon biodiversity, soil and landscape. The impact on cultural heritage is uncertain and dependent on the proximity of development to historic buildings and sites of archaeological importance.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment. In addition, the statutory duties of organisations such as such as the Environment Agency and water companies (in this case Southern Water, Portsmouth Water and Thames Water) to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting and more sustainable forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses it is likely the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the Regional Strategy will not remove the need for more houses within the South East region and addressing this need will still lead to positive impacts on population.</p> <p>It is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of new housing, for example through initiatives such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, New Homes Bonus and the local</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>retention of business rates, which are intended to encourage a more positive attitude to growth and allow communities to share the benefits and mitigate the negative effects of growth.</p> <p>However, in the short and medium terms following revocation the impact could be uncertain in those 47 local authorities that do not have a plan that was in conformity with the regional spatial strategy. For those authorities, the regional plan provided clarity on the quantum of development required; however, following its revocation, there may be a temporary period where some local authorities revert to the original Local Plan whilst replacements are developed and adopted. The amount of development anticipated in this period for those affected authorities may be lower than if the regional plan were in place; however, the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development and its policies to boost the supply of housing will help where plans or policies are absent, silent or out of date. This potential reduction in development will mean that the negative effects associated with development (on biodiversity, water, air, material assets etc) will be lessened as would the beneficial effects (on population). For the 21 local authorities with core strategies and/or local plans in place that contain housing allocations that are consistent with the housing allocation set out in the regional policy, there will be no impact in the short term of revoking the regional policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 159 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should prepare Strategic Housing Market Assessments to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.</p> <p>Paragraphs 173- 177 of the NPPF seek to ensure the viability and deliverability of housing which if successful will lead to a greater proportion of the houses planned for actually being</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>built over the plan period.</p> <p>Paragraph 47 states that to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.</p> <p>Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the housing delivered across the south east region, the location of this housing and other factors such as design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment. Overall, therefore the effects of revocation are uncertain, but are likely to be similar to retaining the Regional Strategy.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level of environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing, remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting and more sustainable forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than that provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects of revocation of the policy will be less. There is also some uncertainty related to timing and a potential transitional delay for those 47 authorities without an adopted plan which conforms with the Regional Strategy.</p>

RS Policy H2: Managing The Delivery of Regional Housing Provision

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires Local Planning Authorities to work in partnership to allocate and manage a land supply to deliver both district housing provision and sub regional and rest of sub-regional area housing provision while ensuring appropriate regards to environmental and infrastructure issues.</p> <p>Local planning authorities working in partnership to allocate and manage a land supply to deliver both district housing provision, sub regional and the rest of the sub regional area housing provision will help to ensure that housing is delivered across the South East, which will deliver significant positive effects to human health and population in the medium and longer terms.</p> <p>Allocating and managing a land supply for housing could have adverse impacts upon the environment without appropriate safeguards in place, and these would be the same as described for policy H1. The policy would lead to provision of the housing target set out in H1 which is likely to have a significant negative impact on water resources. The demand for construction materials and energy is likely to increase, as is traffic. This would result in adverse impacts on air quality and climate, and a significant adverse impact on material assets.</p> <p>The scale of development will have a significant impact on the character of the affected areas, and the land take required for development is likely to have an adverse impact upon biodiversity, soil and landscape. The impact on cultural heritage is uncertain and dependent on the proximity of development to historic buildings and sites of archaeological importance..</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment. In addition, the statutory duties of organisations such as such as the Environment Agency and water companies (in this case Southern Water, South East Water, Veolia Water South East, Sutton and East Surrey Water, Portsmouth Water and Thames Water) to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The impact on cultural heritage is uncertain and dependent on the proximity of development to historic buildings and sites of archaeological importance. More broadly, the actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting and more sustainable forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than that provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the Regional Strategy will not remove the need for more houses within the South East region and addressing this need will still lead to positive impacts on population.</p> <p>It is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of new housing, for example through initiatives such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, New Homes Bonus and the local retention of business rates, which are intended to encourage a more positive attitude to growth and allow communities to share the benefits and mitigate the negative effects of growth.</p> <p>However, in the short and medium terms following revocation the impact could be uncertain in those 47 local authorities that do not have a plan that was in conformity with the regional</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>spatial strategy. For those authorities, the regional plan provided clarity on the quantum of development required; however, following revocation, there may be a temporary period where some local authorities revert to the original Local Plan whilst a replacement Plan is developed and adopted. The amount of development anticipated in this period for those affected authorities may be lower than if the regional plan were in place; however, the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development and its policies to boost the supply of housing will help where plans or policies are absent, silent or out of date. This potential reduction in development will mean that the negative effects associated with development (on biodiversity, water, air, material assets etc) will be lessened as would the beneficial effects (on population). For the 21 local authorities with core strategies and/or local plans in place that contain housing allocations that are consistent with the housing allocation set out in the regional policy, there will be no impact in the short term of revoking the regional policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 159 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should prepare Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.</p> <p>Paragraphs 173- 177 of the NPPF seek to ensure the viability and deliverability of housing which if successful will lead to a greater proportion of the houses planned for actually being built over the plan period.</p> <p>Paragraph 47 states that to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework, including identifying key sites which are</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.</p> <p>Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the housing delivered across the south east region, the location of this housing and other factors such as design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment. Overall, therefore the effects of revocation are uncertain, but are likely to be similar to retaining the Regional Strategy.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level of environmental protection as is the case with retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing, remain the same irrespective of whether the strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting and more sustainable forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than that provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects of revocation of the policy will be less. There is also some uncertainty in relation to timing and a potential transitional delay for those 47 authorities without an adopted plan which conforms with the Regional Strategy.</p>

RS Policy H3: Affordable Housing

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy seeks to deliver a substantial increase in the amount of affordable housing.</p> <p>Provision of an increased level of affordable housing is also a theme within the Regional Economic Strategy (RES). One of the key objectives of the RES is 'Smart Growth' and the physical development required to support this objective include ensuring '<i>sufficient and affordable housing and employment space of the right type and size to meet the needs of the region and support its competitiveness</i>'.</p> <p>Increased provision of affordable housing will have significant benefits to the population and human health. However, the policy and hence its benefits will be very much dependent upon the market being able/willing to deliver the level of affordable housing proposed.</p> <p>There may be short to medium term benefits to soil through the use of vacant buildings and brown field land; however, in order to meet the targets and receive a long term gain, it is inevitable that there will be development on green field land which is likely to have an adverse impact on soil, biodiversity and landscape. The quality of the housing delivered will determine whether the development creates an attractive environment and positive impact on townscape. The net effect on landscape/townscape is uncertain. The impact on cultural heritage is also uncertain and related to the proximity of development to sites of historic/archaeological importance.</p> <p>Provision of this level of housing is likely to lead to greater travel which will have an adverse impact on air quality and climate. However, the policy could help reduce the need to travel if the delivery of affordable housing means that people in need of such housing live close to</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary	
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L		
	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	+	?	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?		<p>where they work. The net effect on air quality and climate is uncertain.</p> <p>The level of water consumption is likely to increase due to increased development, which will have a negative impact on water supply, and use of construction materials will have a negative impact on material assets.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment. In addition, the statutory duties of organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies to plan for, and licence, the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	+	?	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?		<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for more affordable houses in the South East region and is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however it will have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur.</p> <p>Paragraph 47 of the NPPF seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing and states that local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their local plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for affordable housing. This is expected to have the same significant benefits to the population and human health as retention of the policy, although there could be fewer benefits to the population in the short term in those local</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow			Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Light Green		Light Orange	Light Orange	Light Orange	Yellow			Yellow			Light Orange	Light Orange	Light Orange	Yellow			Yellow			<p>authorities without an up to date plan.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Measures in the NPPF, as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution, should provide at least the same level of environmental protection as would be the case with retention of the South East Plan.</p> <p>Assumptions It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing, remain the same irrespective of whether the strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less. There is also some uncertainty in relation to timing and a potential transitional delay for those 47 authorities without an adopted plan which conforms with the Regional Strategy.</p>

RS Policy H4: Type and Size of New Housing

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires local authorities to identify the full range of existing and future housing needs required in their areas and to work with Local Authorities where appropriate</p> <p>The policy will have significant positive impacts upon population and human health as it will help to ensure that the right type and size of new housing is provided. This will help to ensure that there is a good range of housing for people to choose from.</p> <p>Considering gypsies, travellers and travelling show people in addressing the type and size of new housing will also deliver positive effects to population and human health. It could also reduce or remove adverse effects arising from illegal sites. Following publication of the South East Plan in May 2009, reviews of two policies continued until May 2010, when work stopped. Under this review, a new draft policy (H7) was proposed that required local planning authorities to make provision in Local Development Documents to deliver 1,064 net additional permanent residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and 302 for Travelling Showpeople in the period 2006-2016. The draft policy was subject to consultation between June 2009 and September 2009 and an examination in public took place in February 2010. No further work occurred on the review of this policy after this date. As with policy H4, the proposed changes regarding gypsy and travellers would have had significant positive effects on population as it would have contributed to ensuring local needs were met.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty None</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Policy H4 of the South East Plan requires local authorities to identify the full range of existing and future housing needs required in their areas and to work with local authorities where appropriate and includes consideration of gypsies and travellers.</p> <p>The NPPF seeks to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes and it requires local authorities to 'plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community' and to 'identify the size type and tenure of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand'.</p> <p>Of the total 68 local authorities in the South East, 11 have Local Plans which do not make any provision for gypsies and travellers; although in the case of 2, submission Core Strategies do propose pitches although are yet to be adopted. Following revocation of this policy, local authorities will follow the Government's planning policy for traveller sites which is to be read alongside the NPPF and provides the policy framework for these sites. The assessment has revealed that, as with housing more generally, there will be significant positive effects on population and human health as the planning policy for traveller sites requires local authorities to bring forward a five-year supply of land for traveller sites and to update annually. The NPPF, in combination with the traveller site policy, will have a significant positive impact on population and human health. However, for the 11 authorities without specific policies, there may be a delay in the short and medium term whilst policies are updated in line with the NPPF and travellers PPS.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy H5: Housing Density and Design:

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>This policy encourages positive measures to raise the quality of new housing, reduce environmental impacts and facilitate future adaptation to meet changes in accommodation needs. The policy requires Local Authorities to prepare guidelines for the design of new housing in their areas that encourages use of sustainable construction methods and addresses implications of a changing lifestyle for new housing design. The policy also seeks to encourage more sustainable patterns of development and higher housing density.</p> <p>The policy will have significant positive impacts on population and human health by ensuring that housing is of high quality design and encourages higher housing density, which will help to ensure that there is enough housing for the growing population.</p> <p>There will also be positive impacts upon the environment as the policy seeks to reduce the environmental impacts of housing and use of sustainable construction methods. More sustainable patterns of development will also have positive impacts upon air quality and climate.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Assumes that guidelines for the design of new housing would be prepared by Local Authorities.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF requires local authorities to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes through a variety of measures and also requires good design, requiring through paragraph 58 local and neighbourhood plans to develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area and help ensure sustainable development.</p> <p>Given the measures in the NPPF with regards to delivery of high quality of housing and the various measures to ensure good design, it is considered that there will still be a significant positive impact upon human health and the environment. Therefore it is not considered that there will be any significant effects from the revocation of this policy, as the NPPF will ensure that the aims of this policy are implemented.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that local and neighbourhood plans will have robust policies that will set out the quality of development expected for their area.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy H6: Making Better Use of the Existing Stock

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires Local Authorities to assess the existing housing stock in their areas and implement measures to reduce number of vacant, unfit and unsatisfactory dwellings.</p> <p>The policy will have significant positive effects on population and human health through improving existing housing stock. There will also be positive effects on the environment through refurbishing and improving unfit dwellings, thereby reducing the need to construct new dwellings and making better use of existing materials and resources. Refurbishment will have a positive impact on townscape.</p> <p>There would also be a secondary, positive, effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna through regeneration of existing stock which would take pressure off green field sites for development.</p> <p>Impacts on other environmental aspects would remain neutral.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>No areas of uncertainty identified.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The NPPF seeks to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes. The NPPF (paragraph 51) states that Local Planning Authorities should:</p> <p><i>'identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings in line with local housing and empty homes strategies and, where appropriate, acquire properties under compulsory purchase powers. They should normally approve planning applications for change to residential use and any associated development from commercial buildings (currently in the B use classes) where there is an identified need for additional housing in that area, provided that there are not strong economic reasons why such development would be inappropriate'.</i></p> <p>This approach will help to make better use of the existing housing stock, which will have a significant positive effect on population and human health and also have a positive impact on the townscape by contributing to the regeneration of run down housing estates.</p> <p>There would also be a secondary, positive, effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna through regeneration of existing stock which would take pressure off green field sites for development.</p> <p>The Housing Health and Safety Rating System, introduced by the Housing Act 2004, sets out the duties of the local authority in respect of housing which is considered to be unfit for habitation. Other relevant guidance on the issue includes <i>Laying the Foundations: A Housing Strategy for England</i>, which contains within it a section dealing with empty homes and potential for re-use.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None</p>

RS Policy T1: Manage and Invest

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy sets out the management and investment priorities for the policies and proposals of relevant regional strategies, local development documents and local transport plans.</p> <p>Significant positive effects are possible through promotion of sustainable forms of transport, encouraging development that is designed to reduce transport lengths including measures to mitigate the environmental impacts of transport, and ensuring that investment in upgrading the existing transport system is prioritised.</p> <p>There could also be wider benefits through the intention to deliver an urban and rural renaissance as a means of achieving more sustainable patterns of development. This will have significant positive effects on population and human health.</p> <p>The policy also requires Local Development Documents and Local Transport Plans to include measures to minimise negative environmental impacts of transport and, where possible, to enhance the environment and communities through such interventions. This could have positive impacts across the SEA environmental subject areas, however it would depend upon what enhancements there were and so impacts were uncertain.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Many of the effects will depend on the ability to change travel behaviour and the demand for transport. There is a requirement within the policy for regional strategies, local development</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															documents and local transport plans to ensure that policies and proposals include measures to mitigate environmental impacts of transport and, where possible, to enhance the environment and communities through such interventions. Uncertainty It is uncertain what impacts transport infrastructure will have. Many of the effects will depend on the ability to change travel behaviour to more sustainable modes and the demand for transport.
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Likely Significant Effects of Revocation Section 4 of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable transport. In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. Paragraph 31 of the NPPF requires Local Authorities to <i>'work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development'</i> . The NPPF also requires that plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movements are located where the need to travel will be minimised and use of sustainable modes of transport can be maximised. This could have positive impacts on air and climatic factors although there are uncertainties. The NPPF framework provides the basis for a similar level of significant positive impact on population to that predicted by the RS policy. Mitigation Measures None Assumptions It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities will operate under the duty to cooperate to deliver positive outcomes.

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty Many of the effects will depend on the ability to change travel behaviour to more sustainable modes and the demand for transport.</p>

RS Policy T2: Mobility Management

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy seeks a rebalancing of the transport system in favour of sustainable modes based on an integrated package of measures.</p> <p>If successful the policy should result in less use of the private car and more use of sustainable modes of transport. This would have significant benefits for the population and for air quality and climatic factors in the long term. Measures such as improvements to pedestrian routes will help to encourage walking, which again will have positive impacts on human health.</p> <p>As shown in Appendix H the RES reflects the policy through its aim to: <i>reduce road congestion and pollution levels by improving travel choice, promoting public transport, managing demand and facilitating modal shifts.</i></p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal of the South East Plan noted that some roads are at capacity and cannot cope with further increases in traffic generation and so this policy would provide a number of measures to tackle this issue.</p> <p>These measures would reduce reliance on private transport and have an indirect positive impact on air quality and climate. Greater emphasis on pedestrian routes would encourage exercise. Both improved air quality and higher levels of exercise would have a significant, positive impact on population.</p> <p>There are no overall effects on the other subject areas.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions It is assumed that Local Transport Plans and Local Development Documents would have policies which would seek to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Uncertainty There is uncertainty about the extent to which travel behaviour can be changed and success will depend on this.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation Paragraph 17 of the NPPF identifies as a core principle of planning the active management of patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are, or can be made, sustainable. Section 4 (paragraphs 29-41) then deals with promoting sustainable transport. There would be similar significant benefits to the population and human health, to air quality and climatic factors following revocation of this policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None</p> <p>Assumptions It is assumed that Local Transport Plans and Local Development Documents would have policies which would seek to encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport. .</p> <p>Uncertainty Demand management will be a matter for local authorities to consider in consultation with their communities and business partners.</p>

RS Policy T3: Charging

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy sets out that local transport authorities and particularly those responsible for the hubs should consider using powers available under Transport Act 2000 and Local Transport Act 2008, and Government funding to test new charging initiatives.</p> <p>There will be positive impacts on air and climatic factors through this policy as any road charging schemes would be required to be matched with promotion of sustainable modes of transport. This approach would help to reduce reliance upon the private car, which would also have benefits for human health through reduced vehicle emissions.</p> <p>Ensuring that regeneration areas dependent on road access are not disadvantaged will also have positive impacts upon the population and human health as this will help with the regeneration of deprived areas.</p> <p>There are no overall effects on the other subject areas.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that there would be viable sustainable alternative modes of transport if road charging was introduced.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>There is uncertainty about the extent to which travel behaviour can be changed and success of any road charging schemes would depend on this.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>If this policy was revoked there would still be powers available under the Transport Acts, alongside Government funding to allow Local Authorities to implement road charging if they so wished. There would still be an opportunity to use road charging as a means of encouraging a modal shift to more sustainable modes of transport, with resultant positive impacts on population and human health, and air and climatic factors. There are no overall effects on the other subject areas.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that there would be viable sustainable alternative modes of transport if road charging was introduced.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>

RS Policy T4: Parking

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0				+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires Local Development Documents and Local Transport Plans to incorporate a number of measures in relation to parking.</p> <p>This policy would have minor positive impacts on population and human health, and air and climatic factors through encouraging a modal shift away from the private car. This would help to encourage walking and cycling, which would contribute to positive impacts on human health, air and climate through reduced vehicle emissions.</p> <p>While there is nothing specific in the RES about parking, the RES does seek to encourage a modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport. The RES seeks to reduce road congestion and pollution levels by improving travel choice, promoting public transport, managing demand and facilitating modal shifts.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Assumes that Local Development Documents and Local Transport Plans would work in combination and be coherent in terms of aims and objectives.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>There is uncertainty about the extent to which travel behaviour can be changed and success</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															will depend on this, and also the extent to which the promotion of other forms of transport is successful.
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>National policy on local parking standards is set out in paragraph 39 of the NPPF. This leaves decisions on standards to the discretion of local authorities, whereas Policy T4 adheres to the parking policy in the now withdrawn PPG13 which set quantified maximum parking standards across England and allowed regional strategies and local planning authorities only to adopt more rigorous standards.</p> <p>In line with the Duty to Cooperate local authorities are likely to consider setting consistent standards across local authority boundaries where it makes sense to do so, and to utilise the range of powers to control parking provision and enforcement powers under Part 6 of the Traffic Act 2004.</p> <p>Many local authorities in the South East may opt to set rigorous maximum standards similar to those in Policy T4. Revocation will result in no significant difference in environmental effects where they do so. However, other local authorities may decide to take a less restrictive approach and allow higher parking provision where they consider this justified – for example by design considerations. The difference in effects compared to local policy in line with Policy T4 can only be estimated, but an increase in parking provision over and above Policy T4 standards could encourage significantly more trips by car and a corresponding rise in pollution harmful to human health, depending on where the development was located. Additional soil loss would be proportional to the impact of additional parking potentially on green field land take for development. The NPPF is clear that developments that generate significant movement should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions There is no significant overall change in the provision of parking resulting from revocation of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Uncertainty None</p>

RS Policy T5: Travel Plans and Advice

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires that Local Authorities must ensure that their local development documents and local transport plans identify those categories of major travel generating developments, both existing and proposed, for which travel plans should be developed. Local transport authorities should also consider piloting the concept of transport planning advice centres for regional hubs in their local transport plans.</p> <p>The policy will help to ensure that the impacts of large new developments can be mitigated from a transport perspective through the use of travel plans to help ensure that sustainable modes of transport are promoted and used. Transport planning advice centres would further help with regards to promoting sustainable modes of transport. This would have positive impacts on human health and also air and climatic factors.</p> <p>Travel plans would be particularly welcome in light of the capacity issues identified on the regions road network through the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>There are no overall effects on the other subject areas.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Assumes that Local Authorities and Transport Authorities would work together under a duty to co-operate.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty No areas of uncertainty identified.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation The NPPF requires (through paragraph 35) plans to protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport roles for the movement of goods/people. The NPPF states that a key tool for facilitating the use of sustainable transport modes will be the travel plan and that 'all developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan' (NPPF Paragraph 36). Whilst the NPPF does not set out requirements for transport planning advice centres the stated requirement for travel plans will replicate the aims of this policy and ensure that the revocation of this policy will not have adverse effects.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures No mitigation measures are required for the revocation of this policy.</p> <p>Assumptions Assumes that Local Authorities and Transport Authorities would work together under a duty to co-operate.</p> <p>Uncertainty No areas of uncertainty.</p>

RS Policy T6: Communications Technology

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy encourages investment in communications technology that increases access to goods and services without increasing the need to travel and that this should be taken into consideration in identifying future transport needs.</p> <p>The Regional Economic Strategy (RES) also acknowledges the contribution which Information Communications Technology (ICT) makes to 'Smart Growth', one of the three over riding objectives of the RES and sets targets for enhancing ICT awareness and skills.</p> <p>Providing communications technology which increases access to goods and services without the need to travel, will help to reduce air emissions associated with travel, thereby providing positive benefit to air and climatic factors. There will also be a positive benefit to the population arising from the economic benefit derived from improved ICT combined with benefit to health from improved air quality.</p> <p>Factoring in investment in communications technology as a consideration for future transport needs will further help have positive impacts on human health, air and climatic factors. The long term impact on population arising from greater economic growth is expected to be significant.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>No mitigation measures required.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions No assumptions made in considering the retention of this policy.</p> <p>Uncertainty Whilst the policy encourages investment in communications technology, such investment is not guaranteed and is more likely to happen if the economic climate is favourable. In consequence, this has been reflected by the benefits increasing in the long term for population.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revoking this policy could reduce or hold back investment in communications technology at the regional level, which could increase the need to travel if goods and services are not readily accessible. However, the NPPF seeks to support high quality communications infrastructure. Also there is a national project being delivered by Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) unit within the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). The Government has committed to deliver the best superfast broadband network in Europe by 2015. The ambition is to provide superfast broadband to 90% of premises in the UK and to provide universal access to standard broadband with a speed of at least 2Mbps.</p> <p>The NPPF in paragraph 43 requires Local Planning Authorities to ‘...support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including telecommunications and high speed broadband’. This will help to ensure that there is good access to electronic communications, which will in turn help provide good access to goods and services and reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>Seven Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP) have been established in the region and provide support to economic regeneration. ICT is an important consideration in achieving this economic benefit. For example the South East Local Economic Partnership (LEP) vision includes that:</p> <p><i>‘every community across the LEP will be served by super fast (100 mbps or greater) broadband networks.’</i></p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	<p>The combination of the NPPF, the BDUK project and the LEPs provides the framework to achieve the same benefits to population, air quality and climate as would occur under the RS policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None</p> <p>Assumptions Whilst the NPPF makes no direct mention of investment, Local Planning Authorities are required to support electronic communications and so it is assumed that this would involve encouraging financial investment.</p> <p>Uncertainty The development of electronic communications will require favourable economic conditions, to ensure that there is sufficient funding available at the local level.</p>

RS Policy T7: Rural Transport

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires Local Transport Plans to be prepared covering areas that are not wholly urban.</p> <p>This policy will have positive impacts on population and human health as it will help to ensure that rural areas do not suffer from a lack of access to transport. Seeking to improve provision for cyclists and pedestrians in rural areas will have positive impacts on air and climatic factors through helping to reduce reliance on the car. This could have positive impacts on rural villages.</p> <p>Having innovative and adaptable approaches to public transport will help to ensure that rural areas do not fall into decline, which will again have positive impacts on population and human health.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None required.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities would operate under the duty to cooperate to deliver positive outcomes.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>No areas of uncertainty.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Round three Local Transport Plans are either in preparation, or have been adopted, by counties in the region. These establish the proposals for policies and transport priorities, including infrastructure. Public bodies have a duty to co-operate on strategic planning issues that cross administrative boundaries (NPPF, paragraph 178) and are to collaborate with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities are reflected in local plans (paragraph 179). They are to consider producing joint infrastructure and investment plans. The LEPs also have a significant role to play in providing strategic leadership, to set out economic priorities on a number of issues, including local transport and infrastructure priorities.</p> <p>Delivery of sustainable transport infrastructure will have a positive impact on the economy and population. One of the goals of the Transport Plans is to reduce carbon emissions which will have a positive impact on air quality and climate. An improvement in air quality will also provide benefit to human health.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>No mitigation measures required.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>No areas of uncertainty.</p>

RS Policy T8: Regional Spokes

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires relevant Regional Strategies, Local Development Documents and Local Transport Plans to include policies and proposals that support and develop the role of regional spokes by a number of measures</p> <p>The policy will have a number of positive impacts, particularly on human health and air and climatic factors through the promotion of forms of transport other than use of the car. This will help to reduce vehicle emissions, and encourage more sustainable forms of transport. The effects on population and human health are likely to be significant.</p> <p>The Regional Economic Strategy supports the 21 Regional Hubs and notes that 16 lie beyond designated growth areas. The RES will: <i>support these Hubs and Diamonds in developing and implementing their plans to unlock the potential for sustainable growth</i>. This reflects the aim of the policy to support the role of regional hubs as a focus for economic development.</p> <p>There will also be benefits from providing a level of service which supports the role of regional hubs as a focus of economic activity. This will help to boost the economy of the South East which would have positive effects on human health and population.</p> <p>Given the amount of development proposed for the South East in the South East plan there will be adverse impacts on climate change and so all efforts to reduce private car use will help to mitigate this and have positive impacts on air and climatic factors.</p> <p>There no overall other environmental effects.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures None.</p> <p>Assumptions Assumes that Local Authorities and Transport Authorities would work together under a duty to co-operate.</p> <p>Uncertainty Rebalancing of the transport system in favour of non car modes of transport would require behavioural changes in respect in mode of transport choice, which is not certain and success would depend upon this.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF seeks to promote sustainable transport (section 4) with a focus on balancing the transport system in favour of sustainable transport modes. The NPPF also encouraged 'solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion'.</p> <p>A key objective of the NPPF is to build a strong, competitive economy (section 1) and local authorities are required, in the planning process, to <i>Identify priority areas for economic regeneration and infrastructure provision</i> (paragraph 21).</p> <p>The positive impacts on population and human health associated with retention of the RS policy would be the same following revocation.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None.</p> <p>Assumptions Assumes that Local Authorities and Transport Authorities would work together under a duty to co-operate.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p><u>Uncertainty</u> As above.</p>

RS Policy T9: Airports

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires relevant Regional Strategies, Local Development Documents and Local Transport Plans to include policies and proposals that support the development of Gatwick and Heathrow Airports and safeguarding land at Gatwick for a possible future new runway; encourage Southampton Airport to sustain/enhance its role as an airport of regional significance; support an enhanced role for Kent International Airport; and take account of airport operator masterplans produced in accordance with Air Transport White Paper.</p> <p>The policy will have a minor positive effect on population. Whilst the policy provides for substantial increase in airport capacity, increasing regional connectivity, increasing business activity, providing direct and indirect employment; it does also increase the likelihood that there will be localised negative effects on communities living close to airports from potential increases in noise nuisance from increased flights and any disturbance associated with an increase in operating hours of the airport.</p> <p>There is support in the RES (Appendix H) for the region's airports. The RES refers to the Airtrack rail link to Heathrow and Fastway extensions to Redhill and East Grinstead from Gatwick. The RES also seeks to ensure Brighton Mainline <i>provides appropriate facilities for Gatwick Airport users to access London and the South Coast</i> and also provides support for investment in the public transport infrastructure needed to support access to the airports and linking to the rest of the region. These transformational actions complement the RS policy.</p> <p>Supporting the development of the region's airports will result in an increase in both air and ground traffic, which will result in increased air emissions. These will have significant negative impacts on air and climatic factors. There would also be an adverse impact on material assets</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>from construction, and an adverse impact on water quality arising from run-off.</p> <p>Expansion of air capacity is likely to involve ancillary development which could have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soils, cultural heritage and landscape. The extent of these impacts is uncertain due to uncertainties on location of proposed development relative to the location of sites of importance for biodiversity, soils, cultural heritage and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment. Environmental Impact Assessment also provides the mechanism for identifying mitigation measures to address negative effects associated with development proposals.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities would operate under the duty to cooperate to deliver positive outcomes.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Extent of development programme, requirement for extension and nature and sensitivity of surrounding environs.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Future development at, and related to, these airports will continue to be driven by evolving national aviation policy / strategy which is still as set out in the 2003 Aviation White Paper (until it is replaced) and commercial operators decisions with or without the regional strategy. The relevant local authorities will decide what policies are appropriate to support the airports (e.g. housing for employees) informed by local needs and national policies on sustainable development.</p> <p>When planning for ports, airports and airfields that are not subject to a separate national policy statement paragraph 33 of the NPPF states that '<i>plans should take account of their growth and role in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs.</i>' Plans are to take into account this Framework, as well as the principles set out in the relevant national</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>policy statements and the Government Framework for UK Aviation.</p> <p>The revocation of the regional policy is likely to result in similar environmental effects to retention.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities would operate under the duty to cooperate to deliver positive outcomes. Environmental Impact Assessment also provides the mechanism for identifying mitigation measures to address negative effects associated with development proposals.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Extent of development programme, and requirement for extension.</p>

RS Policy T10: Ports and Short Sea Shipping

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary	
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires relevant Regional Strategies, Local Development Documents and Local Transport Plans to include policies and proposals for infrastructure that maintain and enhance the role of a number of ports.</p> <p>The RES provides support for the sustainable growth of Southampton Port and to ‘develop a comprehensive access management package for the Port of Dover’. The RES also proposes investment in ‘the long-term sustainable growth of key ports, particularly the major ports of Southampton, Portsmouth, Dover and Thamesport, and explore future prospects for smaller ports such as Shoreham and Newhaven.’</p> <p>Maintaining and enhancing the role of the ports identified in the RS policy will help ensure that freight can be transported by sustainable means of travel, which will help to reduce the need to travel by road. This will have positive impacts on population and human health and also air and climatic factors through helping to reduce vehicle emissions.</p> <p>Impacts are otherwise uncertain as the expansion of ports infrastructure could adversely impact upon biodiversity, soils, water, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape without appropriate mitigation or safeguards in place.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment. Environmental Impact Assessment also provides the mechanism for identifying mitigation measures to address negative effects associated with development proposals.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities would operate under the duty to cooperate to deliver positive outcomes.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The extent of additional land take which may be associated with expansion of ports together with ancillary development and the associated negative impacts on biodiversity, soils, cultural heritage and landscape. Extent of impact on water resources and material assets from port expansion.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>No change to the positive effects of retaining the policy is expected. The National Policy Statement for Ports (January 2012) (NPS) sets out the framework for decisions on proposals for new port development, including development which are defined as nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIPS). There is existing consent for development in the South East at Southampton, although the NPS acknowledges that other proposals may come forward to satisfy demand (paragraph 3.4.9). The NPPF states that local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges and transport investment necessary to support strategies for the growth of ports, airports or other major generators of travel demand in their areas. Paragraph 33 of the NPPF also states that when planning for ports that are not subject to a separate national policy statement, 'plans should take account of their growth and role in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs'. Local plans should take account of the NPPF as well as the principles set out in the relevant national policy statements.</p> <p>In combination the NPS and the NPPF will have positive impacts on population, human health, air and climate by encouraging the movement of freight by sustainable modes of travel.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Any mitigation measures associated with the provision of new ports infrastructure would be set out in Local Plans and so new mitigation is required here. Environmental Impact Assessment also provides the mechanism for identifying mitigation measures to address negative effects associated with development proposals.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The extent of additional land take which may be associated with expansion of ports together with ancillary development and the associated negative impacts on biodiversity, soils, cultural heritage and landscape. Extent of impact on water resources and material assets from port expansion.</p>

RS Policy T11: Rail Freight

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that the railway system should be developed to carry an increasing share of freight movements. Priority should be given in other relevant regional strategies, local development documents, and local transport plans, providing enhanced capacity for the movement of freight by rail on specified corridors.</p> <p>The RES provides support to gauge upgrading on the South Hampshire – Midlands National Rail Freight Corridor in order to assist in developing the rail network to carry increased freight traffic.</p> <p>Reducing the amount of freight transported by road will result in lower emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases, contributing to improvements to air quality, human health and climate. The objective is to use existing routes, although there may be some upgrade required. These developments would be localised and unlikely to have an adverse effect at a regional scale. Impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape are considered to be neutral.</p> <p>The impacts of development associated with site safeguarding and intermodal interchanges are considered below for policies T12 and T13 respectively.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Whilst improvements to existing routes may occur, it is assumed that no new freight routes will</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															be developed as a result of this policy. <u>Uncertainty</u> None
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF promotes and seeks to maximise the use of sustainable modes of transport. Paragraph 30 states that <i>'encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. In preparing Local Plans, Local Planning Authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport'</i>.</p> <p>The NPPF also requires Local Authorities to <i>'work with neighbouring Authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure to support sustainable development, including rail freight interchanges'</i>.</p> <p>Similar impacts are predicted following revocation of the policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Whilst improvements to existing routes may occur, it is assumed that no new freight routes will be developed as a result of this policy.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As above.</p>

RS Policy T12: Freight and Site Safeguarding

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that relevant Regional Strategies, Local Development Documents and Local Transport Plans should include policies and proposals for freight and site safeguarding.</p> <p>The measures in the policy in relation to site safeguarding for freight will help to ensure that there is adequate infrastructure in place for the movement of freight by rail and water, which will help to reduce movements by road and in turn have positive impacts on air quality, climate and human health. It is probable that, as these sites will be located in close proximity to ports and rail infrastructure, they will be previously developed land. Consequently there are unlikely to be impacts on soil, cultural heritage or landscape. The impact on biodiversity is uncertain as unused, previously developed, land may have biodiversity interest which would require assessment prior to development. There will be some use of water and material assets but the impact on resources is assessed as neutral in a regional context.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment,</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Majority of safeguarded land has been used previously.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As above. Potential impact on biodiversity.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>If the policy was revoked, the safeguarding of strategic transport sites would depend on the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>provisions within each Local Plan.</p> <p>The NPPF requires that plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people. Together with other measures the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable forms of transport, including the requirement for Local Authorities to <i>'work together to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges'</i>.</p> <p>Revocation of the RS policy would lead to the same positive impact on air quality, climate and population. There would be similar uncertainty with respect to impact on biodiversity.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>NPPF policies for sustainability, sustainable transport and conserving and enhancing the natural environment.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Majority of safeguarded land has been used previously.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>As above. Potential impact on biodiversity.</p>

RS Policy T13: Intermodal Interchanges

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that the regional planning body should work jointly with DfT Rail, Network Rail, the Highways Agency, the Freight Transport Association and local authorities to identify broad locations within the region for up to three inter-modal interchange facilities.</p> <p>The explanatory text identifies that suitable sites are likely to be located where key rail and road radials intersect with the M25. They should also be rail connected or capable of rail connection at reasonable cost.</p> <p>The policy will help to deliver a modal shift in transport towards more sustainable modes of transport through the provision of inter-modal interchange facilities, which will help freight transfer easily between different forms of transport. There will therefore be positive impacts on human health, air and climatic factors. Over the long term, the effects on climatic factors could be significant if the scale anticipated were achieved on the strategic network.</p> <p>Appropriate sites are not identified specifically, although policy T12 seeks to safeguard sites which could be used for intermodal facilities. Consequently the impacts on biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and landscape are the same as predicted for T12. The impacts on water resources and material assets are assessed as neutral.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment,</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions Majority of safeguarded land has been used previously.</p> <p>Uncertainty As above. Potential impact on biodiversity.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>If the policy is revoked then there would be uncertainty over the provision of inter modal interchanges which, if not provided, could result in greater use of road transport for movement of freight. However, the NPPF encourages use of sustainable forms of travel and requires that 'Local Authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers for the provision of viable infrastructure to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges'. This will help to ensure that there are still methods of transferring freight between different modes of transport, which will have positive impacts on human health, air and climatic factors. As is the case for retention of the policy the impact on climate may be significantly positive in the longer term.</p> <p>The impact on biodiversity would depend on the type of land used for development and could be uncertain. Areas of undisturbed (safeguarded) previously developed land can develop biodiversity interest.</p> <p>The impacts on soil, water, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape are assessed as neutral.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures NPPF policies for sustainability, sustainable transport and conserving and enhancing the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions Majority of safeguarded land has been used previously.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty As above. Potential impact on biodiversity.</p>

RS Policy T14: Transport Investment and Management Priorities.

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that details of regionally significant transport investment currently programmed for delivery in the South East are set out in Appendix A of the South East Plan. The policy requires regional partners led by Regional Planning Body to work together to produce an Implementation Plan for investment.</p> <p>The policy addresses transport investment priorities and states that regional partners need to work together to produce an Implementation Plan for delivery.</p> <p>Delivery of the planned transport infrastructure will underpin the economic development proposed for the region, and will have a significant positive impact on the population.</p> <p>The policy focuses on improving the performance of existing transport networks, but some development outside of existing areas is envisaged. This would involve land take and is likely to have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soils and landscape. The impact on cultural heritage is uncertain, dependent on proximity to sites of historic and/or archaeological value. Improvements to the transport infrastructure is likely to have an adverse impact on local air quality and climate, but the effect may also be positive in the longer term if the objective of low carbon and emissions travel is realised. The impact is considered to be uncertain. Use of construction materials will have an adverse impact on material assets. Broader housing and economic development facilitated by the infrastructure will have an adverse impact on material assets and water resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies within the RS including CC1, Sustainable Development.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities will operate under the duty to cooperate to deliver positive outcomes.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Effects on air quality and climate which will be governed by the effectiveness of an improved transport network, and the sustainability of new development. Effect on cultural heritage will be related to the location of new development. Economic climate which will dictate investment in infrastructure.</p>
Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Round three Local Transport Plans are either in preparation, or have been adopted, by counties in the region. These establish the proposals for policies and transport priorities, including infrastructure. Public bodies have a duty to co-operate on strategic planning issues that cross administrative boundaries (NPPF, paragraph 178) and are to collaborate with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities are reflected in local plans (paragraph 179). They are to consider producing joint infrastructure and investment plans. The LEPs also have a significant role to play in providing strategic leadership, to set out economic priorities on a number of issues, including local transport and infrastructure priorities.</p> <p>The framework exists to prioritise and deliver transport infrastructure within the region, subject to the uncertain economic conditions which would be the same for retention or revocation of the policy. The impacts of revocation are the same as for retention of the policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities will operate under the duty to cooperate to deliver positive outcomes.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Effects on air quality and climate which will be governed by the effectiveness of an improved transport network, and the sustainability of new development. Effect on cultural heritage will be related to the location of new development. Economic climate which will dictate investment in infrastructure.</p>

RS Policy NRM1: Sustainable Water Resources and Groundwater Quality

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that water supply and ground water will be maintained and enhanced through avoiding adverse effects of development on the water environment. A twin tracked approach of demand management and water resources will be pursued.</p> <p>In the South East water is a scarce and often overcommitted resource, with three quarters of drinking water in the South East coming from underground aquifers.</p> <p>New development within the region has the potential to put increased pressure on river and coastal habitats as both household water demand, and the amount of effluent discharged back into the water bodies, increases.</p> <p>The policy requires local authorities to "identify any circumstances under which new development will need to be supported by water efficiency standards exceeding extant Building Regulations standards".</p> <p>The policy is aimed at protecting the water resource through a variety of means and in turn protecting wildlife. This will have significant positive impacts on the water resource, population and human health, and biodiversity.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The policy was broadened at draft stage to include ground water and support adequate provision of sewerage infrastructure.</p> <p>To mitigate against abstraction impacts on European sites, the policy was changed to include a reference to "Maintaining an adequate supply and encouraging water efficiency whilst meeting Habitats, Birds and Water Framework Directives.</p> <p>The sustainability appraisal of the regional plan reports that housing allocations in 11 (listed)</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
																											<p>districts should be reconsidered due to water resource constraints: housing figures were not revised, but supporting text was added to Policy NRM1 noting that further water supply constraints work will be particularly required in relation to development within the listed districts.</p> <p>There are several references within the final South East Plan to the need to undertake Water Cycle Studies which can explore water resource issues at a fine scale in conjunction with proposed allocations.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>The rate of development will continue in line with expectation and in the locations that are identified in the Plan.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The effects of climate change on water resources.</p>	
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Water company Water Resource Management Plans (WRM09) 2010-2035 will set out how water companies aim to ensure there will be sufficient water to meet potable demand without environmental consequences during the South East Plan period.</p> <p>Water companies have therefore already considered future supply and demand in terms of planning water consumption for the region in their approved and emerging plans.</p> <p>This, along with the duty to cooperate and NPPF policies relating to planning strategically across local boundaries (paragraphs 156 an 178-181), will mean that local authorities should continue to plan for and address water infrastructure implications of development through policies in their local plans, reflecting local circumstances and priorities and to actively engage with interested parties. Water companies will have an opportunity to work with local authorities on water infrastructure implications as part of local plan preparation.</p> <p>The location of development will be a critical component of this. River Basin Management Plans for the region identify the pressures that the water environment faces and include action plans requiring cross boundary and input from a range of organisations. Local authorities can</p>	

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>be expected to continue to work together on cross boundary strategic issues.</p> <p>The Code for Sustainable Homes encourages higher levels of water efficiency. Local authorities can require housing developments in their area to meet specified Code levels.</p> <p>However, development will continue and there will continue to be the potential for significant negative effects on water resources and natural habitats, including European sites.</p> <p>It is expected that the impacts on the environment of revocation would be the same as the retention of the policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Investigation of water efficiency, water demand, collection and storage and recycling measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The effects of climate change on water resources.</p> <p>Continuing rates of development.</p>

RS Policy NRM2: Water Quality

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that water quality will be maintained and enhanced through avoiding adverse effects of development on the water environment.</p> <p>The policy aims to protect and enhance water quality, and avoid adverse effects of development on the water environment. To achieve avoidance of adverse effects on the environment the policy will see water cycle studies, groundwater vulnerability maps, groundwater source protection zone maps and asset management plans being prepared. This will give a greater understanding of the water environment for the basis of making decisions regarding development.</p> <p>The policy aims to ensure that environmental water quality standards and objectives as required by European Directives are met. This will have a beneficial effect on water quality and habitats. There may also be a beneficial effect on landscape where habitats present are integral to the landscape character values.</p> <p>The policy looks at the rate and location of development with the aim that development will not breach either relevant "no deterioration" objectives or environmental quality standards. This will have a beneficial effect on water quality and habitats.</p> <p>The policy also identifies that development should not be permitted where it presents a risk of pollution or where satisfactory pollution prevention measures are not provided in areas of high groundwater vulnerability. This will have a beneficial effect on water quality, soils, habitats and human health.</p> <p>This requires wastewater infrastructure to be planned to meet demand so that the rate and location of development does not lead to a deterioration in water quality and that local authorities should "ensure that the environmental water quality standards and objectives as</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>required by European Directives are met", including the requirements of the Habitats and Birds Directives as well as other European Directives.</p> <p>There will be positive impacts on biodiversity, population, soil, water, cultural heritage and landscape for the reasons identified above.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>No significant effects identified however the following measures have been suggested.</p> <p>Local authorities must ensure that their Local Development Frameworks take account of the limits of existing sewage treatment works, and ensure that wastewater treatment infrastructure is delivered in parallel with (and ideally prior to) the delivery of the new development, particularly on the south coast: Policy NRM2 was amended to ensure wastewater infrastructure is planned to meet demand, that the rate and location of development does not lead to a deterioration in water quality, and to specify that where new development risks affecting water quality, new infrastructure to prevent this will need to be delivered before development goes ahead. Specific mitigating measures identified include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements in efficiency of use of existing infrastructure. Decrease consumer demand, manage leakage and look at use of meters. Planning and provision of sustainable new water infrastructure. Investigations into infiltration rates into some sewerage networks with potential to increase capacity. Provision of supporting infrastructure before development commences. <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Future trend for increases in development based on economic growth</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Regulatory mechanisms exist to ensure an adequate, safe and sustainable water supply. National Policy already gives the Environment Agency, water and sewerage companies, developers, landowners and others an important role in taking a pro-active approach to working together to identify, characterise, plan and manage the water environment taking into account biodiversity sites of international importance.</p> <p>In achieving integrated water management and delivery of the European Union's Water Framework Directive, plans and strategies should have regard to River Basin Management Plans and water companies' asset management plans.</p> <p>In addition the government believes the key driver for reducing water use is through demand management measures, these measures would be taken forward outside the scope of the planning framework.</p> <p>Paragraph 109 of the NPPF also states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.</p> <p>Given the existing statutory and policy framework along with the NPPF a similar framework exists for minimising adverse effects on the environment and promote similar positive impacts on biodiversity, population, soil, water and landscape. In consequence, the impacts following revocation are considered to be similar as for retention of the RS policy.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None identified</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The speed and consistency of measures to improve the more efficient use of water across the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															Region.

RS Policy NRM3: Strategic Water Resources Development

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that there is a demonstrable need for new water resource schemes and increased demand management over the period of the Plan to cater for water supply needs of current and future development and the protection of the environment.</p> <p>This form of development meets the needs of the South East and other regions and therefore has inter-regional implications.</p> <p>In terms of coordination between organisations to address these issues this is discussed above under policy NRM 1.</p> <p>The Panel Report (paragraph10.14) acknowledged that strategic water resource development has lead times of up to 20-25 years from conception to operation. It acknowledged that the need for these and deliverability of these schemes was uncertain but that the policy should provide a supportive planning framework by giving a firmer steer to local plans to facilitate the strategic infrastructure that can be shown to be necessary.</p> <p>The policy identified five locations that LPAs should allocate and safeguard for these purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Thames reservoir, Oxfordshire • Enlargement of Bewl reservoir, Kent • Broad Oak reservoir, Kent • Clay Hill reservoir, East Sussex

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Havant thicket reservoir, Hampshire <p>This policy identifies strategic new water resource options that may be required to be operational over the plan period.</p> <p>In working with the water companies and the Environment Agency these sites would be safeguarded from other development options. Additional sites are also identified as being considered. In determining applications for sites, the environmental impacts and potential social and environmental benefits should be considered, amongst other criteria.</p> <p>This policy has a focus on the increased supply of water through the creation of new water resource schemes and increased demand management. There will be benefits for the population arising from the creation of jobs and significant benefit, in the longer term, resulting from the increased supply of water. The impact on water resources will be positive through increased supply and management of the water resource. To create additional water supply will require new reservoirs and there will generally be a loss of land and therefore a negative effect on soils as a result.</p> <p>The effects of the creation of new reservoirs are very varied and complex depending on the method of construction and location of the reservoir and the receptors that may be affected. The effects on biodiversity, landscape and cultural heritage are uncertain based on the location of the reservoirs and the attributes that may be affected. For example there may be positive benefits for biodiversity if the proposed reservoir is to be located in an area that has poor biodiversity values currently and by the addition of a water resource may be improved. Alternatively an area that may already have biodiversity value may need to be used for the reservoir and the existing biodiversity values would be lost. This uncertainty also applies to landscape and cultural heritage values.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in relation to the use of material assets for the construction of reservoirs and the potential for future resource to be sterilised by the construction of reservoirs.</p> <p>There is uncertainty in relation to climatic factors related to the capacity to provide for additional flood storage and potential for changes in regional climatic conditions leading to dryer or wetter conditions.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures None identified</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty There are too many uncertainties with each of the proposed sites which are identified as “may” be required to be able to make an informed assessment of all topic areas in the short, medium and long term.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The South East Plan policy to safeguard locations provides a supportive planning framework for the five identified locations for a reservoir. Revocation of this policy will mean that the relevant Local Plans do not have to conform to this Regional Strategy policy and the location of development will be a matter for local planning authorities to take forward through local plans in the context of the NPPF’s policy framework. However, one of the core principles of the NPPF is the duty to co-operate to address larger than local issues. Given the limited locations available for such a scale of development as the proposed reservoirs this is an important issue that will need to be addressed by LPAs under this duty.</p> <p>Strategic water resource development is however the responsibility of water companies to address. By way of example, the provision of a reservoir at Abingdon was a matter considered as part of Thames Water Water Resources Management Plan 2009 (WRMP09). This included a Public Inquiry examining this issue of additional water supply infrastructure options and the proposals for Abingdon. As set out in Thames Water’s Statement of Response (March 2012) to their draft Final Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) (page 23), the potential for an Upper Thames reservoir at Abingdon remains one of a number of options in the feasible options list but it is not selected in the preferred plan for the draft WRMP09. This will be a matter to be considered as part of next WRMP in 2014.</p> <p>Therefore, there is less prospect of this broad location being required in the short-term for a</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>reservoir. However, the potential for a major reservoir in this location has not been ruled out indefinitely.</p> <p>Revoking the policy will have complex and uncertain consequential impacts on other environmental considerations. The potential effects on biodiversity are uncertain as not proceeding with new reservoirs could be beneficial for the biodiversity of the area that is no longer subject to change/development, or negative if it previously had a low biodiversity value and a reservoir would have improved it. The impacts on biodiversity could also be negative if not improving water supply (e.g. new reservoirs) has detrimental effects on local wildlife during times of high water stress, however if new water supplies are provided then the impact could be positive.</p> <p>There is a potential that the impact on soils would be neutral if the reservoirs are not built in the short and medium term, although this could become negative in the long term as infrastructure is brought forward and greenfield sites are developed.</p> <p>Given the statutory requirement on water companies to ensure provision of water, the commitments in the WRMPs will ensure that the effects on water remain positive as will the effects on population and health.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>LPA's and water companies may need to work together to ensure water resource planning and spatial planning policies work in concert to deliver the strategic water infrastructure needed in the south east. There may be the need to safeguard land for such infrastructure in the relevant Local Plan, where the need is demonstrated.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>These are uncertain impacts on biodiversity, climate change, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape given the uncertainties associated with the actual need for reservoirs or whether the need for additional water resources could be addressed through an alternative method, such as increased capacity at water treatment works, bulk transfer of water from</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															outside the area, improved demand management and better leakage control. Uncertainties are compounded by a lack of detail on location and siting.

RS Policy NRM4: Sustainable Flood Risk Management

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires the sequential approach to development in flood risk areas set out in PPS25 to be followed. Inappropriate development should not be allowed or permitted in flood zones 2 and 3 (Diagram NRM1, page 90 of The South East Plan), areas at risk of surface flooding (critical drainage areas) or areas with a history of groundwater flooding, or where it would increase flood risk elsewhere, unless there is over-riding need and absence of suitable alternatives.</p> <p>The South East has an extensive area at risk of flooding, due to coastal, tidal, fluvial, groundwater and surface run-off flood risk. There are over 208,000 properties in the South East that have been identified as being within an area where there is a high probability of flooding.</p> <p>This policy on sustainable flood risk management will help to ensure that flood risk is appropriately managed in most parts of the region. This will be achieved by defending existing properties through the protection of existing flood defences and locating new properties where there is little risk of flooding. This will have significant benefits to the population. The protection of floodplains could also have benefits for biodiversity and soil in those areas.</p> <p>However, despite this policy the Sustainability Assessment of the draft South East Plan had key concerns and felt that despite this policy and other mitigation measures, the Final South East Plan was still likely to increase flood risk and have an impact on flood risk management policies. Flood risk should also take into account climate change therefore providing a benefit by increasing resilience for the potential climate change in the region.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>NPPF section 10 on meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change sets out the detail of national planning policy in relation to flood risk management.</p> <p>Policies on the location of new development are covered by the policies in the NPPF, paragraphs 100 to 104. In particular, this seeks to ensure that inappropriate development is avoided in areas at risk of flooding, but where development is necessary that it is safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. To this end, local plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property. Aside from water compatible development and, exceptionally, essential infrastructure, development should not be permitted in the functional floodplain.</p> <p>The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 provides for comprehensive management of flood risk for people, homes and businesses. The Flood Risk Regulations 2009 impose a duty on the Environment Agency and lead local flood authorities to take steps to identify and prepare for significant flood risk.</p> <p>In line with the NPPF policy and its technical flood risk guidance, local authorities should continue to take advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant bodies (including adjacent local authorities) when preparing policies in their planning documents on flood risk management and in relation to areas potentially identified as at risk of flooding.</p> <p>Taking the above into account following revocation of the plan there is still potentially</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>significant benefits for the population and benefits for biodiversity and soil. Flood risk should also take into account climate change therefore providing a benefit by increasing resilience for the potential climate change in the region.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> Uncertainty remains around the effects of climate change.</p>

RS Policy NRM5: Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that the local planning authorities and other bodies shall avoid a net loss of biodiversity and actively pursue opportunities to achieve a net gain across the region.</p> <p>The South East contains significant areas of importance for nature conservation, including sites designated for their international importance. There have been major losses of habitats and species populations in the region over recent decades due to inappropriate management, agricultural practices, development and fragmentation.</p> <p>The policy approach is to ensure the conservation and where appropriate, enhancement of biodiversity of valuable wildlife sites across the region. The policy also reflects the highest level of protection that exists for European sites.</p> <p>The policy identifies the need to 'work to secure improved habitat management and combat diffuse pollution with regard to European sites.</p> <p>The policy enshrines the concept of a 'feedback loop', whereby regional housing allocations can be revised if local authority HRA / AA reveals that (when considered within the light of the further spatial and technical detail available at the local level) the housing level within the South East Plan cannot be delivered without adverse effects upon European sites.</p> <p>The policy also commits the South East Plan to the production of future guidance which will provide more detail on avoidance and mitigation measures regarding particular European sites or suites of sites.</p> <p>This policy is better able to protect sites of international nature conservation importance from</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>indirect impacts, and to integrate with the Green Infrastructure policy.</p> <p>To reduce recreational and urbanisation pressures the policy provides a buffer zone or 'exclusion zone' where no development is permitted.</p> <p>The policy is a wide-ranging and comprehensive series of policy interventions which seek to provide considerable regional direction in the mitigation/avoidance of adverse effects on European sites as a result of the specific issues of recreational pressure and urbanisation but without producing policy which is unwieldy (such as having a separate detailed NRM6-type policy for each European site) or which applies specific measures in too generic a manner.</p> <p>The policy results in significant positive effects on biodiversity/flora/fauna, soils, climatic factors and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The legal requirement for local planning authorities to ensure that internationally and nationally designated sites are given the strongest level of protection and that development does not have adverse effects on the integrity of sites of European or international importance for nature conservation would be unchanged by revocation of policy NRM5.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural environment, including by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. The Framework underlines that pursuing sustainable development means moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature. This means that local</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>planning policies should promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan.</p> <p>In particular NPPF section 11 on conserving and enhancing the natural environment, and paragraphs 109 to 119 are particularly relevant. The NPPF policies relating to green infrastructure and planning for climate change to mitigate the effects on biodiversity (paragraph 99 of the NPPF) are also relevant.</p> <p>The Framework also makes clear that planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss.</p> <p>Overall given the commitment in the Natural Environment White Paper to work towards a net gain in the value of nature and to assist with the delivery of green infrastructure it is concluded that revocation of policy NRM5 will leave a policy framework in its place that is as strong as NRM5 resulting in benefits to a biodiversity, soil, climatic factors and landscape. The magnitude of any enhancement will depend on local circumstances and decisions.</p> <p>On biodiversity targets, the Panel noted (para 10.41) that these were inspirational and challenging and would need updating in due course; these provide a guide for the setting of local biodiversity targets.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>It is assumed that local authorities will work together making use of the duty to cooperate and the local nature partnerships to optimise the benefits to biodiversity and that BAP partnerships continue to operate.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p><u>Uncertainty</u> None</p>

RS Policy NRM6: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that new residential development which is likely to have a significant effect on the ecological integrity of Thames Basin Heaths Special Conservation Area (SPA) will be required to demonstrate that adequate measures are put in place to avoid or mitigate any potential adverse effects. Such measures must be agreed with Natural England.</p> <p>Priority should be given to directing development to those areas where potential adverse effects can be avoided without the need for mitigation measures. Where mitigation measures are required, local planning authorities, as Competent Authorities, should work in partnership to set out clearly and deliver a consistent approach to mitigation based on a defined set of principles.</p> <p>The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) is designated under European Directive 79/409/EEC because of its population of three heathland species of birds. This designation covers parts of 15 local authority areas and three counties and is likely to have a major impact upon the potential for development within these areas and other adjoining it.</p> <p>This policy for the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area was added specifically to deal with development pressures on the heaths, in response to the findings of the HRA / AA of the Draft South East Plan.</p> <p>The impact of this policy upon the Thames Basin Heaths SPA will be positive. Moreover, when taken in conjunction with the 'feedback loop' mechanism described in the reworded NRM5, and the ability for the regional allocation to therefore be revised if lower tier HRA finds that allocations are not deliverable without an adverse effect, these two policies provide considerable security that adverse effects will not be allowed to result on the Thames Basin</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Heaths SPA.</p> <p>The effects are likely to be significant positive effects for biodiversity and landscape and positive for soil and cultural heritage. However the policy has the potential to have a negative effect on the housing supply in the locality of the SPA.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>This specific policy has been put in place given the scale and location of the SPA in relation to existing and proposed housing development in some of the most pressurised areas of the regions as the impact of the South East Plan on the SPA is of great significance.</p> <p>As set out in the RS paragraph 9.35 the policy sets out an approach to avoid and mitigate as required, based on current evidence at that time to safeguard the SPA's integrity. The policy provides a common statutory Development Plan planning policy covering the whole SPA within the South East. As such as paragraph 9.38 of the RS sets out this potentially enables LPAs to take forward the detailed aspect of its implementation via joint Development Planning documents or supplementary guidance to this RS policy.</p> <p>The legal requirement for local planning authorities to ensure that internationally and nationally designated sites are given the strongest level of protection and that development does not have adverse effects on the integrity of sites of European or international importance for nature conservation would be unchanged by revocation of this policy.</p> <p>It should also be noted that in response to the Thames Basin Heath SPA concerns, Councils with the Heaths, and other partners have now established the Thames Basin Heaths Joint</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Strategic Partnership to guarantee the delivery of new homes and the long term protection of the SPA. Many councils in the Heaths now offer suitable alternative natural green space (SANG) away from the SPA and its nesting birds and plants. The Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership adopted a long term Strategy in February 2009 (the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Delivery Framework). This will continue to ensure the appropriate mitigation strategy remains in place.</p> <p>The duty to cooperate, NPPF and these Local Nature Partnership also offer means that local authorities should continue to ensure that land use are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their area.</p> <p>It is recognised that the location of development will be a matter for the Local Plan's to take forward in the context of the NPPF's policy framework, the requirements of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Delivery Framework and wider International and government legislation and policy which should maintain the positive effects associated with retention of the policy.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>The Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership adopted a long term Strategy in February 2009 (the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Delivery Framework). This will continue to ensure the appropriate mitigation strategy remains in place however, there remains some uncertainty as precise arrangements for cooperation between LPAs under the Partnership.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>How cooperation between LPAs will be achieved.</p>

RS Policy NRM7:Woodlands

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires that in the development and implementation of local development documents and other strategies, local authorities and other bodies will support the implementation of the Regional Forestry and Woodland Framework, ensuring the value and character of the region's woodlands are protected and enhanced.</p> <p>The South East is the most wooded regions in England, with around 15% of the land area, although coverage varies around the region. This provides many social and environmental benefits for its inhabitants.</p> <p>The policy aims to protect ancient woodland from damaging development and land use, and promotes extension and replacement of other woodland lost through development. This policy will have a significant positive impact on protecting biodiversity and ancient woodlands (cultural heritage).</p> <p>The requirement to replace woodland which is unavoidably lost to development with new woodland on at least the same scale, and promoting and encouraging economic use of woodlands and promoting procurement of sustainable timber products could have positive effects on the population by way of employment and human health. There would also be protection and maintenance of soil and water environments and contribution to air quality improvements. There would be significant positive effects on landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
																											<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Given the other demands on green space in urban area, there is uncertainty about the number and types of trees that will be planted outside of major tree planting schemes.</p>	
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The policy does not have specific spatial outcomes but provides generic principles for Local Plans. The policy seeks to achieve an increase in woodland cover by protecting and achieving better management of existing woodland and promoting new planting where consistent with landscape character.</p> <p>Protection for ancient semi-natural woodland and other woodlands of acknowledged national or regional importance would remain in the absence of the plan (paragraph 118 of the NPPF). This would maintain the significant positive benefits on biodiversity, landscape and cultural heritage.</p> <p>The NPPF makes clear that planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss. The Government's White Paper, The Natural Choice, recognises and supports the protection and improvement of woodland and forests. The NPPF also states local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change. Therefore LPAs in devising their Local Plans will need to take these policies into account.</p> <p>Government promotes use of Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) timber. There is a timber procurement advice note that applies to central government departments, executive agencies and NDPBs.</p> <p>There is a marginal risk that revoking this policy will lose an element of its promotion of the use of procuring for sustainable timber products. However, this is not considered to likely to</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															cause a potential significant effect. <u>Mitigation</u> None <u>Assumptions</u> None <u>Uncertainty</u> The specific outcomes will depend on decisions made by local planning authorities, private land owners and local communities and are therefore uncertain but still positive.

RS Policy NRM8: Coastal Management

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that an integrated approach to the management and planning in coastal areas will be pursued. Appropriate social, economic and environmental objectives should be taken into account in relevant plans. The dynamic nature and character of the coast should be managed through enhanced collaboration between organisations and across administrative boundaries.</p> <p>The South East has an extensive coast line which is an important environmental, economic and recreational resource. There is a long history of human intervention along the coastline with considerable lengths having been developed, while over 90% of its frontage is defended against erosion and/or flood risk.</p> <p>The SA considers that this policy directs local authorities to “Avoid built development on the undeveloped coastline unless it does not adversely affect environmental, cultural and recreational resources. In particular, development must not compromise the ability to preserve the interest features of Natura 2000 sites through managed retreat of coastal habitats in response to sea level rise”. The SA also states that this policy also directs local authorities to “identify opportunities for, and ensure that development does not prejudice options for managed realignment ... in the future”, and that this will apply to all sub-regions even though it is not specifically mentioned in any of the sub-regional chapters and sets a clear policy framework for the avoidance of coastal squeeze in spatial planning (SA April 2009, p 272, para 15.6.17).</p> <p>The conservation of the coastal environment and coastal waters will bring significant benefits to biodiversity, landscape and cultural heritage. Maintaining tranquillity in undeveloped areas will also have benefits to human health. Minimising the risk of flooding and protecting coastal areas has significant benefits for climatic factors.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
																											<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The SA records that the RSS did not allocate further housing to Fareham, Gosport, Havant, Portsmouth or Southampton, which, being small and relatively urban, with extensive borders with coastal European sites, would have the greatest difficulty in delivering Policy NRM8.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The Southern Hampshire authorities are likely to have to build in areas of high flood risk and many of those areas also constitute the relatively few locations where managed retreat of the Solent European sites could be achieved. Therefore, there is a possible risk to protection of coastal habitat from pressures of development.</p>	
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The Environment Agency's flood and coastal risk management investment strategy (2010-2035) will apply.</p> <p>The NPPF, legislation on climate change, biodiversity and flooding and the use of shoreline management plans provides similar environmental benefits as Policy NRM8.</p> <p>Paragraphs 93 to 108 of the NPPF deal with meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change. Paragraph 94 states that local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and other considerations. Paragraph 99 adds that new development should be planned to avoid vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change, including coastal change.</p> <p>The NPPF (particularly paragraphs 105 to 108) sets out how local planning authorities should reduce risk from coastal change and apply Integrated Coastal Zone Management across local authority and land/sea boundaries. Through their local plans, local planning authorities should identify Coastal Change Management Areas and be clear as to what development is appropriate in such areas, and in what circumstances; and make provision for development</p>	

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>and infrastructure that needs to be relocated away from these areas. In addition paragraph 114 provides for the maintenance of the character of the undeveloped coast, protecting and enhancing its distinctive landscapes, particularly in areas defined as Heritage Coast, and seeks improvement to public access to and enjoyment of the coast.</p> <p>Paragraph 156 requires local planning authorities to set out the strategic priorities for the area in the local plan, including strategic policies to deliver the provision of infrastructure for flood risk and coastal change management.</p> <p>Coastal groups, comprising members from local coastal authorities, the Environment Agency and other relevant organisations, can form partnerships to look at the strategic management of the coast. These groups can produce Shoreline Management Plans to assess risks from coastal flooding and erosion and set out how to manage these risks. Shoreline Management Plans can continue to provide evidence for local plan-making.</p> <p>The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 places a duty to co-operate on all relevant flood and coastal erosion risk management authorities. The national Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England sets out the considerations and the approach to be followed to risk management, including the functions of those involved and how they can work together better. The national strategy seeks to ensure that local risk management decisions are made in a consistent way, and that decisions made in one area take account of impacts on another.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Shoreline management plans will remain if the plan is revoked.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Development of the coast, while bringing economic benefits to the region, can have negative effects on biodiversity including internationally protected sites. The requirements of the Habitats Regulations enable such development only where there are no alternatives and the development is considered to be of imperative reasons of overriding public interest and</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>subject to the delivery of compensatory measures.</p> <p>There are also potentially negative effects on air quality and climatic factors from shipping which are uncertain and not considered here.</p>

RS Policy NRM9: Air Quality

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary					
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L						
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy identifies that strategies, plans and programmes and planning proposals should contribute to sustaining the current downward trend in air pollution in the region. This will include seeking improvements in air quality so that there is significant reduction in the number of days of medium and high air pollution by 2026.</p> <p>The primary driver for national, regional and local air quality management is the protection of human health, although the impact of certain pollutants on wildlife habitats and vegetation is also a concern.</p> <p>The SA recommended that the South East Plan policy on air quality should: apply to ship and air transport as well as road transport; refer to impacts on sites of international nature conservation importance; require developments with significant air pollution to reduce air pollution from other sources by an equivalent amount; and state that improvements in air quality by one sector should not be used to allow another sector to increase their pollution (SA April 2009, p80, para 5.8.1).</p> <p>The SA Summary notes that policy on air quality was rephrased to promote reduction in the environmental impacts of transport and congestion management, and support for the use of cleaner transport fuels (SA Statement May 2009, p6, para 2.2.1, 9th bullet).</p> <p>The SA summary also notes that the HRA / AA raised concerns about air quality in the region, and in particular about the effect of air pollution on sites of international importance for nature conservation. In response, Policy NRM9 on air quality was strengthened to require plans and proposals to contribute to sustaining the current downward trend in air pollution in the region; and to require local authorities to take into account the effect of air pollution on species and</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
																															<p>habitats of international importance for nature conservation. A clause was also inserted to Policy LF6, to require air quality standards not to be breached at Chertsey (SA Statement May 2009, p 11, para 3.2.1, 2nd bullet).</p> <p>The policy should have positive effects on human health, biodiversity, air quality and climatic factors by looking to contribute to the downward trends in air pollution in the region.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty None</p>			
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states: Planning policies should sustain compliance with and contribute towards EU limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and the cumulative impacts on air quality from individual sites in local areas. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in Air Quality Management Areas is consistent with the local air quality action plan.</p> <p>The NPPF emphasises good design, and paragraph 35 gives more detail on design relating to transport. Paragraph 144 states the requirements on local planning authorities relating to dust and particle emissions. In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment.</p> <p>Given that the South East Plan policy provided generic advice on how Local Plans can achieve improvements and the existence of the above national policy framework for Local Plan to take account of there should be no material adverse impact of revoking this policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures New development will have to introduce measures to mitigate against increased air</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															emissions. Assumptions None Uncertainty None

RS Policy NRM10: Noise

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>This policy requires measures to address and reduce noise pollution will be developed at regional and local level.</p> <p>This policy provides generic advice and looks to locate new residential and other sensitive developments away from existing or planned future sources of significant noise. This will have a positive beneficial effect on the health of new residential occupiers. In addition human health will be benefited by the requirement for traffic management, sound attenuation and sound proofing and screening for noise, all with the aim of reducing noise levels experienced by occupiers of residential developments.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Sound attenuation will need to be introduced to major transport schemes. Sound proofing will be required as part of sustainable housing design.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>NPPF paragraph 123 (in particular) sets out the policy on avoiding noise. This along with the Defra's Noise Policy Statement for England sets an appropriate framework for Local Plans</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>and planning decisions.</p> <p>This national policy on noise would apply in the absence of an adopted local plan policy given the lack of up to date plans across the region.</p> <p>Given the South East Plan policy provided generic advice on how Local Plans can achieve improvements and the existence of the above national policy framework for Local Plan to take account of there should be no material adverse impact of revoking this policy.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None</p>

RS Policy NRM11: Development Design For Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies ways local authorities should implement development design for energy efficiency. This policy is seen as a vital tool in preparing the region for the effects for climate change and the need to reduce consumption of resources. The policy requires local authorities to set ambitious and deliverable targets for the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy to supply new development. Therefore there are potentially significant benefits for climatic factors and potential benefits for air and human health through the reduction in emissions from fossil fuel based energy sources.</p> <p>The policy also establishes that developments of more than 10 dwellings or 1000m² should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable low-carbon sources. There is the promotion of renewable energy sources such as passive solar, solar water heating, photovoltaic, ground source heat pumps and, in larger scale developments, wind and biomass.</p> <p>There are potential adverse landscape effects from larger scale developments from wind turbines and minor negative effects on a small proportion of the population from noise and shadow.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA of the installations likely to have significant effects on the environment should address mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed any renewable energy sources with gaseous emissions will be controlled by</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															environmental permits and have no significant effects. Uncertainty None
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Likely Significant Effects of Revocation The Merton rule, as it is colloquially known, is a prescriptive planning policy that requires new commercial buildings over 1,000 square meters to generate at least 10% of their energy needs using on site renewable energy equipment. In a similar vein the Planning and Energy Act 2008 provides that a local planning authority may in their development plan documents include policies imposing reasonable requirements for renewable or low carbon energy, and additional energy efficiency standards, in development in their area. One of the 12 core principles of planning set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF is to support the transition to a low carbon future, including encouraging the use of renewable resources (for example, by the development of renewable energy). NPPF Paragraph 94 states that local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change in line with the provisions of the Climate Change Act 2008. Paragraph 95 of the NPPF sets out how planning can support the move to a low carbon future, by stating that local planning authorities should plan for new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions; actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings; and when setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, do so in a way consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards. In doing so as the NPPF sets out in paragraphs 173-174 Local Plans will need to be deliverable and ensure viability is maintained by considering the cumulative impact of burdens and obligations on landowners and development. Given that the viability of development depends on local market conditions there are potentially positive benefits in revoking this policy. This is in respect of population and health arising from housing development being able to come forward whose viability would have

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>been eroded by this policy. This is because revoking this policy will enable LPAs to consider the viability of development in local market circumstances as opposed to applying a regional based obligations which would have not had regard to local viability.</p> <p>However it is recognised that, in the absence of set targets in the policy, some sites may be more viable than would have been the case under the policy. Therefore, without targets, it is possible that use of renewable sources would be lower and consequent effects on climate would be minor positive rather than significant positive as would be the case with the policy in place.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> There is some uncertainty around the effects on climatic factors in relation to how local authorities will view developments that do not meet former SE Plan policy aspirations.</p>

RS Policy NRM12: Combined Heat and Power

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that local development documents and other policies should encourage the integration of combined heat and power (CHP), including mini and micro-CHP, in all developments and district heating infrastructure in large scale developments in mixed use. The use of biomass fuel should be investigated and promoted where possible.</p> <p>Local authorities using their wider powers should promote awareness of the benefits of mini and micro CHP in the existing building stock.</p> <p>This policy encourages the use of combined heat and power (CHP) and district heating systems in new buildings. CHP and district heating systems use excess heat from electricity generation or industry to heat or cool buildings in the locality. Traditional CHP is highly efficient and can result in savings in energy use. CHP also reduces carbon emissions therefore there is the potential for a positive benefit on climatic factors, human health and air quality.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The assessment is similar to NRM 11 as Combined Heat and Power is a form of renewable energy and falls within the Planning and Energy Act 2008.</p> <p>Moreover, the policy is about encouraging, investigating and promoting the use of CHP rather than being prescriptive about its incorporation into new development. There are wider government policies on CHP (e.g. DECC's CHP incentives http://chp.decc.gov.uk/cms/chp-incentives/).</p> <p>Revoking this policy should have no material effects as the NPPF supports the move to a low carbon future. In particular paragraph 97 identifies that to help increase use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy, local planning authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources.</p> <p>The move to a low carbon future will have positive benefits for air quality, climatic factors and human health and population.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None</p>

RS Policy NRM13: Regional Renewable Energy Targets

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies minimum regional targets for electricity generation from renewable sources to be achieved by the development and use of all appropriate resources and technologies.</p> <p>Renewable energy resources with the greatest potential for electricity generation are onshore and offshore wind, biomass and solar. The renewable energy resources with the greatest potential for heat generation are solar and biomass.</p> <p>Regional renewable energy targets have been set, reflecting the potential for renewable energy, to ensure that the region contributes towards the UK targets for renewable energy. The targets are set through to 2026. It is estimated that if the targets are met in 2026 renewable sources would provide sufficient energy for one million homes.</p> <p>NRM13 set out regional renewable energy targets, for four time periods and termed in installed capacity in MegaWatts (MW) and % electricity generation capacity.</p> <p>Whilst the targets form part of the Development Plan it is noted that the RS explanatory text sets out that the regional targets are “only illustrative” (paragraph 9.76). This has been taken into account in assessing the policy, but greater weight has been placed on the fact that the target itself does form part of the Development Plan.</p> <p>As of April 2012 DECC estimates there is 417.2MW completed installed capacity in the South East. These data are drawn from DECC’s Planning Database Project and are available at the RESTATS website.</p> <p>The renewable sources of energy with the greatest potential for electricity generation are</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>onshore and offshore wind, biomass, and solar. The generation of renewable energy will have significant climatic factor benefits. There will also be benefits to the human health of the population as a whole through clean technologies (less pollution) and in the longer term through increased security of supply. There is, however, potential for adverse effects on the landscape from wind turbines and minor negative effects on a small proportion of the population from noise and shadow.</p> <p>Policy NRM15 in part tries to offset the potential negative effects by identifying that renewable energy development should be located to minimise adverse effects on landscape, wildlife, heritage assets and amenity, with priority given to development in less sensitive parts of the countryside and coast where outside urban areas. However, the range of effects will be dependent on the type and location of the renewable energy source proposed.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA of the installations likely to have significant effects on the environment should address mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Proposed type and location of installations and therefore potential effects will vary.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of this policy removes the minimum regional targets for electricity generation from renewable sources.</p> <p>However, in its absence, there are a variety of other legislative and national policy commitments that will continue to promote the take up of renewable energy. Under the European Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC), the UK has a binding target to ensure 15% of energy comes from renewable sources by 2020. The government has completed National Renewable Energy Action Plan (NREAP) to demonstrate how this target will be met. The Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) is currently undertaking a</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>programme of work to develop a coordinated delivery plan to implement the commitments made in the NREAP.</p> <p>The Climate Change Act 2008 established a legally binding target to reduce the UK's greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% below base year levels by 2050, to be achieved through action at home and abroad. To drive progress and set the UK on a pathway towards this target, the Act introduced a system of carbon budgets which provide legally binding limits on the amount of emissions that may be produced in successive five-year periods, beginning in 2008. The first three carbon budgets were set in law in May 2009 and require emissions to be reduced by at least 34% below base year levels in 2020.</p> <p>The Carbon Plan published in December 2011, sets out the Government's plans for achieving the emissions reductions committed to in the first four carbon budgets, on a pathway consistent with meeting the 2050 target. The Carbon Plan brings together the Government's strategy to curb greenhouse gas emissions and deliver climate change targets.</p> <p>The NPPF section 10 on meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change sets out clear policy on low carbon and renewable energy sources. Given the NPPF's policy for LPAs to support the move towards a low carbon economy (paragraph 94) and increase the supply of renewable energy (paragraphs 97-99), there is still national planning support for investment and supply if the policy is revoked.</p> <p>The renewable energy policy in all adopted local plans and/or core strategies in the region have been examined and are presented in Appendix C. The renewable energy policy sets a regional target and does not apportion this target between local authorities. The analysis shows that, consistent with that approach, local plans and/or core strategies do not tend to therefore include targets for the production of renewable energy at local authority level, although a few (4) do.</p> <p>Some 26 local plans adopted before the South East Plan was adopted do not contain policies on renewable energy and for these authorities there is a clear policy gap. 42 authority local plans in the South East region (adopted before and after the Regional Strategy was adopted) contain policies which encourage a certain proportion of on-site renewable and/or decentralised renewable or low carbon energy and require it to be provided for developments</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>over a certain specified size. Plans and core strategies put in place after the adoption of the East of England Plan tend to contain more detailed policies for the development of renewable energy and some make reference to the regional target for renewable energy generation.</p> <p>The amount of renewable energy development will be dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities made in the light of their adopted plans, the NPPF and other material considerations.</p> <p>The difference between overall renewable energy generation across the region will also depend on the response of local communities and other councils to Government policies to help ensure they benefit from and have more of a stake in hosting renewable energy developments.</p> <p>However, given that there is in the region of 600MW consented schemes in the SE as of April 2012, [source: DECC RESTATS], completion of this would meet the 2016 target and the 2020 target, but still fall some way short of the 2026 target. However not all consented schemes are completed so this potential positive effect on the short and medium term remains a little uncertain. Equally the 2020 and 2026 targets are at least 8 years away so the full picture on installed capacity to those dates is not clear. Therefore there is a substantial amount of time available for promoters to bring forward potential additional capacity.</p> <p>The removal of South East Plan targets avoids a potential for these to be seen as a ceiling of capacity in the region and so in the long term installed capacity would not be unduly constrained which could have long term positive effects on population, climate change and air.</p> <p>The impact on landscape is uncertain as it depends on how and where renewable energy is provided.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The impact on landscape is uncertain as it depends on how and where renewable energy is provided.</p> <p>There is some limited uncertainty around the installed capacity outturns in future.</p>

RS Policy NRM14: Sub-Regional Targets for Land-based Renewable Energy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that development plans should include policies, and development proposals as far as practicable should seek, to contribute to the achievement of the regional and indicative sub-regional targets for land-based renewable energy.</p> <p>Local authorities should collaborate and engage with communities, the renewable energy industry and other stakeholders on a sub regional basis to assist in the achievement of the targets set.</p> <p>Sub-regional targets provide an indication of the relative potential for development of different resources at sub-regional level. These indicate that the distribution of resources and potential for development is reasonably even throughout the region with the significant opportunities for the deployment of all of the major resources – wind, biomass and solar – in all parts of the region.</p> <p>The policy would ensure a significant positive effect on the climatic factors due to a reduction in carbon emissions; however, the effects on landscape are uncertain as they depend on the mix of technologies that come forward under the policy as well as the potential influence of windfarms on landscapes.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA of the installations likely to have significant effects on the environment should address mitigation measures.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary				
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L					
																															<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Proposed type and location of installations and therefore potential effects will vary. The effects on landscape are uncertain as they depend on the mix of technologies that come forward under the policy as well as the potential influence of windfarms on landscapes.</p>	
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	? ? ?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>See above response to NRM13 for discussion of revoking a policy relating to renewable energy targets.</p> <p>In the RS policy's supporting text, the sub-regional targets are described as indicative (paragraph 9.88) and as providing an indication on the relative potential for development (paragraph 9.84).</p> <p>The 2016 targets provide certainty for developers that in these local authority areas the planning context is favourable in bringing forward capacity up to this level. However, there could now be an increase in investment and capacity supply in these areas as the removal of South East Plan targets avoids the potential for these to be seen as ceilings of capacity in the region. Given the NPPF's policy for local authorities to support the move towards a low carbon economy (paragraph 94) and increase the supply of renewable energy (paragraphs 97-99), there is still national planning support for investment and supply if the policy is revoked.</p> <p>This could influence investment decisions and therefore it is possible that removing the policy could increase uncertainty.</p> <p>Overall this should be seen in context of the evidence in NMR13 and the good progress made to date on installed capacity, so the majority of impacts of revoking the policy are assessed as not material, except those discussed above and in NMR13.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures EIA of the installations likely to have significant effects on the environment and should</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															address mitigation measures. <u>Assumptions</u> None <u>Uncertainty</u> Proposed type and location of installations and therefore potential effects will vary. The effects on landscape are uncertain as they depend on the mix of technologies that come forward under the policy as well as the potential influence of windfarms on landscapes.

RS Policy NRM15: Location of Renewable Energy Development

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that local development documents should encourage the development of renewable energy in order to achieve the regional and sub-regional targets. Renewable energy development, particularly wind and biomass, should be located and designed to minimise adverse effects on landscape, wildlife, heritage assets and amenity. Outside of urban areas, priority should be given to development in less sensitive parts of the countryside and coast, including previously developed land and in major transport areas.</p> <p>This policy encourages the development of renewable energy resources in order to achieve regional and sub-regional targets but that the developments should be located such that adverse impacts on landscape, wildlife, heritage assets, landscape and amenity are minimised. Provision of energy, with minimal environmental impact, will have a positive impact on population and climatic factors.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>.Revocation of this policy removes the requirement that local development documents should encourage the development of renewable energy in order to achieve the regional and sub-regional targets.</p> <p>However, in its absence, there are explicit provisions in the NPPF that will continue to promote the take up of renewable energy. The NPPF section 10 on meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change sets out clear policy on low carbon and renewable energy sources. Given the NPPF's policy for LPAs to support the move towards a low carbon economy (paragraph 94) and increase the supply of renewable energy (paragraphs 97-99), there is still national planning support for investment and supply if the policy is revoked.</p> <p>The NPPF also sets out how some of the potential effects from renewable energy will be addressed. It makes clear that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural environment, including by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. The Framework underlines that pursuing sustainable development means moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature. This means that local planning policies should promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan.</p> <p>In particular NPPF section 11 on conserving and enhancing the natural environment, and paragraphs 109 to 119 are particularly relevant. The NPPF policies relating to green infrastructure and planning for climate change to mitigate the effects on biodiversity (paragraph 99 of the NPPF) are also relevant.</p> <p>The Framework also makes clear that planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss.</p> <p>Provision of energy, with minimal environmental impact, will have a positive impact on</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															population and climatic factors. <u>Mitigation Measures</u> None <u>Assumptions</u> None <u>Uncertainty</u> None

RS Policy NRM16: Renewable Energy Development Criteria

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that through their local development framework and decisions, local authorities should, in principle, support development of renewable energy. Criteria-based policies should be set.</p> <p>This policy sets out issues to consider when local development documents are being written and used. The issues to be considered include potential benefits to communities and opportunities for environmental enhancement. This policy provides positive benefit to population from the provision of energy, and on climatic factors due to use of renewable sources. The environmental impacts will depend on the detail of the proposals, including for environmental enhancement, but are likely to include positive impacts on biodiversity, cultural heritage and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Nature of environmental enhancements accompanying specific proposals.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>NPPF section 10 states policy around climate change and renewable energy: paragraph 93:</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Planning plays a key role in helping shape places to secure radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimising vulnerability and providing resilience to the impacts of climate change, and supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. This is central to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development.</p> <p>National Planning Statement EN-3 Renewable Energy Infrastructure is identified as being helpful to local planning authorities (LPAs) in preparing their local impact reports. In England and Wales this NPS is likely to be a material consideration in decision making on relevant applications that fall under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Whether, and to what extent, this NPS is a material consideration will be judged on a case by case basis. The NPS covers energy from biomass >50MW, offshore wind >100MW and onshore wind >50MW.</p> <p>Revoking this policy will simplify the planning policy context. The impacts associated with revocation will be similar to those for retention of the policy.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None</p>

RS Policy W1: Waste Reduction

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil		Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary				
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L					
Retention	?	?	+	0	0	+	?	?	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	?	?	+	?	?	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that the regional planning body, SEEDA, the Environment Agency and other regional partners will work together to reduce growth of all waste to 1% per annum by 2010 and 0.5% per annum by 2020.</p> <p>This policy recognises that the waste hierarchy requires reduction as the first stage of resource management, therefore reinforcing aspects of national policy. The policy reflects the European and national policy context and, in seeking to achieve the required shift towards more sustainable waste management, builds on principles set out in the Waste Strategy for England and PPS10.</p> <p>The policy provides the framework for regional partners to work with consumers, industry and all tiers of local government to raise awareness of the need to reduce waste and achieve the minimisation and reduction targets necessary.</p> <p>The policy identifies that encouraging waste reduction should be in all regional and local strategies.</p> <p>The overall objective of Government policy on waste is to protect human health and environment by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible.</p> <p>Reducing waste volumes will have significant benefits on human health, through reduction in traffic volumes, with associated benefits for air quality. The reduction in the amount of waste disposed of to landfill will reduce the risk of water contamination and emission of green house gases (i.e. methane). Reduction in waste volumes will lead to the reduction in the requirement for waste management facilities with associated benefits for many aspects of the environment</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>including landscape, cultural heritage, soil and biodiversity, however the benefits are likely to be longer term as the time required to instigate waste reduction practices are likely to take time. Long term significant benefits will occur for material assets through the reduction in volumes of waste.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Requirement for regional and local strategies to be developed, regional working group to be established and programmes to be developed.</p> <p>Assumptions Policy actions are put in place.</p> <p>Uncertainty Scores are uncertain on a number of factors because the residual impact following any mitigation measures are unknown.</p>
Revocation	?	?	+	0	0	+	?	?	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	?	?	+	?	?	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The overall objective of Government policy on waste, as set out in the strategy for sustainable development, is to protect human health and the environment by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible. By more sustainable waste management, moving the management of waste up the 'waste hierarchy' of prevention, preparing for reuse, recycling, other recovery, and disposing only as a last resort, the Government aims to break the link between economic growth and the environmental impact of waste.</p> <p>[The objectives of the policy reflect national policy which will remain in place. In addition adopted waste and mineral plans remain in place which promote the reduction of waste generation.</p> <p>The Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (adopted April 2006) states that the determining authority will promote action and encourage measures to assist in slowing the rate of growth in waste over the period of this Plan, and will particularly encourage waste</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>reduction in all development strategies. The performance target for this policy is to seek to reduce growth of all waste to 1% per annum by 2010 and to take measures during the Plan period which will facilitate a reduction to an increase of 0.5% per annum by 2020. (Policy 10).</p> <p>The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2007) states that the rate of growth in controlled waste will be reduced so that the annual amount of municipal, commercial and industrial waste requiring management will be stabilised at 3.12 million tonnes a year by 2025 [this represents a reduction to annual growth to 0.5% by 2020] (Policy S2).</p> <p>Isle of Wight's Core Strategy including waste and minerals (adopted March 2012) states that the Council will seek to reduce the level of waste wherever possible by providing waste resource infrastructure and management options in accordance with the waste hierarchy (this includes prevention in the first instance), and ensuring that infrastructure for the management of waste is developed with due regard to the principles of sustainable development (SP8).</p> <p>Surrey County Council's Waste Core Strategy (adopted May 2008) provides through Policy CW1 that Waste Minimisation will be promoted by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) working in partnership with the business community in Surrey to raise awareness and to provide information and advice; (ii) raising awareness amongst the general public in Surrey to inform purchasing and lifestyle decisions; (iii) working in partnership with other local authorities and public bodies in the County to ensure that waste minimisation is addressed in all contracts for works and services; (iv) working in partnership with the other local planning authorities to influence and encourage developers and contractors to design and to manage the subsequent construction contracts for housing, commercial and all other developments in Surrey in ways which minimise waste in the construction process; (v) encouraging local planning authorities to include policies in development plan documents seeking to minimise waste in construction; and (vi) leading by example.

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Although East Sussex and Brighton and Hove's Waste Local Plan (adopted February 2006) does not contain explicit policies seeking to reduce waste, it does contain an objective to progressively reduce the amount of waste disposed of to land.</p> <p>Waste and Mineral Plans in Kent, Milton Keynes, Berkshire, Oxfordshire and West Sussex also do not contain explicit policies to reduce waste generation but do contain recycling targets which could lead to a reduction in waste.</p> <p>The effects as a result of revocation are likely to be the same as with the South East Plan in place.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Time required to meet waste reduction target.</p>

RS Policy W2: Sustainable Design, Construction and Demolition

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Retention	?	?	+	0	0	+	?	?	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	+	?	?	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that development plan documents will require development design, construction and demolition which minimises waste production and associated impacts.</p> <p>The overall objective of Government policy on waste is to protect human health and the environment by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible. This is recognised as requiring more sustainable waste management and moving management of waste up the waste hierarchy, of prevention, preparing for reuse, recycling, other recovery and disposing only as a last resort. Therefore the principles of this policy are in line with national policy.</p> <p>This policy aims for the reduction in waste through sustainable design and construction and demolition practices which minimise waste production and promote recycling. The policy identifies that there is particular opportunity for this policy to be implemented in the regions strategic growth point and growth regions.</p> <p>Viewing waste as a resource will have significant benefits to material assets from example by replacing primary aggregate with recycled construction waste and making effective use of recovered energy. The significant benefit is more likely to be in the longer term as large construction projects have a long lead time and construction period.</p> <p>The policy reinforces aspects of national policy that will need to apply across the region if waste generation is to be successfully decoupled from economic growth. It respects the European and national policy context and, in seeking to achieve the required shift towards more sustainable waste management, builds on principles set out in the Waste Strategy for England and PPS10. Paragraph 35 of PPS10 identifies that good design and layout in new development can help to secure opportunities for sustainable waste management, including</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
																																	<p>for kerbside collection and community recycling as well as for larger waste facilities.</p> <p>Reducing waste volumes will have significant benefits on human health in the long term, through reduction in traffic volumes, with associated benefits for air quality. The reduction in the amount of waste disposed of to landfill will reduce the risk of water contamination and emission of green house gases (i.e. methane). Longer term significant benefits will also be achieved for human health and population through the protection of areas that may have been used to extract material assets, therefore these areas are potentially available for recreation and effects associated with extraction of material, such as transport, effects on biodiversity and landscape may be eliminated. Reduction in waste volumes will lead to the reduction in requirement for waste management facilities with associated benefits for many aspects of the environment including landscape, cultural heritage, soil and biodiversity. However the benefits are likely to be longer term as the time required to instigate waste reduction practices is likely to take time.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty There is uncertainty in the short and medium term for biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and landscape as it may take time for the identification, provision and acceptance of suitable alternatives and recycled materials to replace materials now used.</p>	
Revocation	?	?	+	0	0	+	?	?	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	+	?	?	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of this policy removes a requirement for development plan documents to include development design, construction and demolition which minimises waste production and associated impacts. However, in its absence, the positive effects will still be delivered through a variety of existing statutory and policy commitments.</p> <p>Site Waste Management Plans Regulations 2008 require that any developer who intends to</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>carry out a project on any one construction site with an estimated cost greater than £300,000 excluding VAT will have to complete a Site Waste Management Plan that will include identifying actions for different waste types, including re-using, recycling, recovery and disposal.</p> <p>The Government's Code for Sustainable Homes is the national standard for the sustainable design and construction of new homes. The Code aims to reduce carbon emissions and create homes that are more sustainable.</p> <p>As indicated above, the objectives of PPS10 which will remain in place. In addition adopted waste and mineral plans remain in place which promote the reduction of waste generation.</p> <p>The overall objective of Government policy on waste is to protect human health and environment by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible.</p> <p>One of the key objectives of PPS 10 is to secure the recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health and without harming the environment. The delayed National Waste Management Plan will replace the 2007 Waste Strategy in late 2013. In the Government Review of Waste Policy in England 2011, it has been identified that the Government will develop a comprehensive Waste Prevention Programme by the end of 2013, but in the meantime will work with businesses and other organisations across supply chains on a range of measures designed to drive waste reduction as part of a broader resource efficiency programme.</p> <p>The effects as a result of revocation are likely to be the same as with the South East Plan in place as a result of other national policies that will remain in place.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>There is uncertainty in the short and medium term for biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															landscape as it may take time for the identification, provision and acceptance of suitable alternatives and recycled materials to replace materials now used.

RS Policy W3: Regional Self-Sufficiency

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that waste authorities and waste management companies should provide management capacity equivalent to the amount of waste arising and requiring management within the region's boundaries, plus a declining amount of waste from London. Provision of capacity for rapidly increasing recycling, composting and recovery should be made reflecting the set out targets and requirements.</p> <p>This policy includes for all Waste Authority Areas in the region to make provisions for London's exports for disposal by landfill and will usually be in line with the Landfill Directive targets and, by 2016, new permissions will only provide for residues of waste that have been subject to recycling or other recovery process. Waste Planning Authorities (WPAs) should provide landfill capacity for an apportionment of London's exported waste.</p> <p>Being regionally self sufficient should lead to decreasing traffic movements with positive benefits to air, climatic factors and human health. Through waste minimisation strategies and increased recycling and re-use the requirement for new and extended landfill capacity should slow this will have uncertain environmental benefits for biodiversity, cultural heritage, soil and landscape by extending the time when new facilities are required and deferring when the effects will occur.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions</p> <p>The amount of waste imported from London will fall to 2015, and remain stable after that date. Short term benefits for environmental factors as requirement for new facilities is deferred.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The supporting text recognises that no account was taken of existing contracts, although for the early part of the plan period, these will have an impact on effects identified. Through waste minimisation strategies and increased recycling and re-use the requirement for new and extended landfill capacity should slow this will have uncertain environmental effects for biodiversity, cultural heritage, soil and landscape by extending the time when new facilities are required and deferring when the effects will occur.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	?	+	+	?	?	?	?	+	+	?	-	+	?	-	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>National policy requires communities to take more responsibility for the waste they produce. However, it also recognises that it is not feasible for local authorities to be totally self-sufficient in waste management, and that some movement of waste across local authority boundaries will continue. It should be noted that only two authorities, Hampshire and Surrey have adopted the same apportionment level, but all authorities have made a commitment to accept some of London's waste.</p> <p>The impacts of revocation of this policy remain uncertain in the short term as much will depend on the nature of individual agreements and the length of time it will take waste planning authorities to put in place plans to deal with London's waste. The London Plan envisages a progressive reduction in the amount of waste exported to other parts of the country, but is still reliant on planning authorities outside the capital to take its waste. Individual waste authorities may decide to restrict the amount of London waste they accept, but such an approach will still need to take account of the duty to co-operate, as required under the Localism Act 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Consequently London waste may have to travel a further distance to be dealt with, with impacts on air and climate change, although this should reduce in time as London develops greater capacity to deal with its waste.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Individual contract arrangements between London authorities and individual sites are honoured. London authorities make increasing provision for their own waste and meet their recycling targets in the London Plan.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The effects on air and climatic factors are uncertain in the short term and minor negative in the medium term as increased travel may be required to dispose of waste. Through waste minimisation strategies and increased recycling and re-use the requirement for new and extended landfill capacity should slow. This will have uncertain environmental effects for biodiversity, cultural heritage, soil and landscape by extending the time when new facilities are required and deferring when the effects will occur.</p>

RS Policy W4: Sub-Regional Self-Sufficiency

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary	
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that Waste Management Authorities (WPA's) will plan for net-self sufficiency through the provision for management capacity equivalent to the amount of waste arising and requiring management within their boundaries. A degree of flexibility should be used in applying the sub-regional self-sufficiency concept.</p> <p>This policy identifies that where appropriate and consistent with Policy W3, capacity should be provided for London and adjoining sub-regions. WPAs should work together and cooperate to make provision for flows across regional and sub-regional boundaries looking for possible sites that are served by sustainable transport modes.</p> <p>This policy reflects national policy requirements for individual authorities to take more responsibility for managing their own waste. It should have positive effects on air and climatic factors by reducing the distance waste should travel for recovery or disposal and secondary beneficial effects on human health. Beneficial effects will occur for material assets with sub-regions being able to identify the type of facilities and specialised reprocessing facilities required to service waste generated at the sub-regional level.</p> <p>The effects on biodiversity, soil, water, cultural heritage and landscape are uncertain as the policy relates to planning, flexibility and provision of potential flows across boundaries to provide for sub-regional self-sufficiency. Therefore the potential effects on these receptors cannot be clearly identified.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions</p> <p>Waste Planning Authorities provide up-to-date plans for, and monitor, additional waste capacity to manage waste arisings in their local area.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Forecasts of waste arisings may be higher or lower than that assumed in developing this policy.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation is going to have no overall effect. Waste Planning Authorities must still comply with national policy in Planning Policy Statement 10 and the National Planning Policy Framework. They make it clear that waste planning authorities should continue to plan for the waste management needs in their area, taking into account capacity requirements, the proximity principle and that they should continue to monitor waste arisings.</p> <p>One of the core planning principles of the NPPF is based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues.</p> <p>While it is noted that only two authorities, Hampshire and Surrey have adopted the same apportionment level to accept London's waste as identified in WS3, all authorities have made a commitment to accept some of London's waste.</p> <p>National policy requires individual authorities to take more responsibility for managing their own waste. It should have positive effects on air and climatic factors by reducing the distance waste should travel for recovery or disposal, and also have secondary beneficial effects on human health. Beneficial effects will occur for material assets with local regions being able to identify the type of facilities and specialised reprocessing facilities required to service waste generated.</p> <p>The effects on biodiversity, soil, water, cultural heritage and landscape are uncertain depending on the type and location of facilities that are required. Therefore the potential effects on these receptors cannot be clearly identified.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Waste Planning Authorities provide up-to-date plans for, and monitor, additional waste capacity to manage waste arisings in their local area and where relevant to deal with other areas' waste where necessary.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The effects on biodiversity, soil, water, cultural heritage and landscape are uncertain depending on the type and location of facilities that are required. Therefore the potential effects on these receptors cannot be clearly identified.</p>

RS Policy W5: Targets For Diversion From Landfill

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that a substantial increase in recovery of waste and a commensurate reduction in landfill is required in the region. Accordingly, the targets for diversion from landfill of all waste needs to be achieved in the region (Policy W6 targets are a component of these).</p> <p>This policy requires WPAs to ensure that policies and proposals are in place to contribute to the delivery of the targets in the policy and that waste management companies take the targets into account in their commercial decisions.</p> <p>National planning policy requires individual planning authorities to plan for waste arising in its area, and to monitor progress in delivering it. The reduction in landfilling will have positive effects on water, air, climatic factors and material assets.</p> <p>The reduction in the amount of waste disposed of to landfill will reduce the risk of water contamination and emissions of green house gases (i.e. methane). However, modern waste management practice seeks to prevent this.</p> <p>A policy to divert waste from landfill will serve to drive waste up the waste hierarchy and to potentially make more land available for housing and environmental benefit, however there are a number of uncertainties around this.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Time taken for achievement of rates of diversion from landfill.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>National waste policy (Waste Strategy for England 2007, Defra) will remain in place. This policy seeks to divert waste from landfill although it does not set specific targets. However, the overall objective of Government policy on waste is to protect human health and the environment by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible. By more sustainable waste management, moving the management of waste up the 'waste hierarchy' of prevention, preparing for reuse, recycling, other recovery, and disposing only as a last resort, the Government aims to break the link between economic growth and the environmental impact of waste. This will enable positive effects to remain in force following revocation of the South East Plan.</p> <p>The Landfill Directive aims to drive waste up the management hierarchy. Demanding targets have been set to reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal waste that may be landfilled. The main requirement is to achieve by 2020 a reduction in the amount of biodegradable municipal waste disposed of to land to 35% of that which was produced in 1995.</p> <p>In addition, several WPAs have policies in their respective waste local plans which seek to reduce the amount of waste for landfill.</p> <p>The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2007) sets out annual landfill capacity to reflect the emerging South East Plan target. These targets state that by 2020, 84% of all waste is to be diverted from landfill.</p> <p>Surrey County Council's Waste Core Strategy (adopted May 2008) states that planning permission will be granted to enable sufficient waste management capacity to be provided to, inter alia, achieve the regional targets for recycling, composting, recovery and diversion from landfill by ensuring a range of facilities is permitted (CW4).</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>The East Sussex and Brighton and Hove's Waste Local Plan (adopted February 2006) contains an objective to progressively reduce the amount of waste disposed of to land. Para 5.6 continues on to state that this objective is fundamental to the strategy, and is driven by national policy and the EU Landfill Directive.</p> <p>The Berkshire Waste Local Plan (adopted Dec 1998) sets out that the local authorities will seek to phase out the use of landfill and landraising in the county area as a means of disposal of putrescible waste by 2006 (Policy WLP3).</p> <p>The Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (adopted April 2006) seeks to support recycling to move waste up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Milton Keynes Waste Development Plan Document 2007-2026 (adopted February 2008) states that to meet regional and local waste targets and arisings to enable sufficient waste management capacity to 2026, a strategic site for a waste management facility for final treatment, and other recycling, composting and transfer activities will be provided for.</p> <p>The effects as a result of revocation are likely to be the same as with the South East Plan in place.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Rates identified in the plan and adopted waste and mineral plans will remain the same following the revocation of the plan.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Time taken for achievement of rates of diversion from landfill.</p>

RS Policy W6: Recycling and Composting

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>This policy identifies the targets for recycling and composting that have been set. Waste authorities should adopt policies and proposals to assist delivery of these targets and waste management companies should take them into account in their commercial decisions.</p> <p>National planning policy requires individual planning authorities to plan for waste arising in its area, and to monitor progress in delivering it.</p> <p>The targets that are set in this policy require a large increase in the amount of all waste recycled and composted.</p> <p>To achieve the requirements of this policy may require the construction of new facilities for the purpose of recycling, composting, reprocessing and transfer. Recycled goods will require additional transport compared to landfilling operations leading to potentially increased traffic to transfer materials. Creation of new or expanded facilities will have uncertain effects on biodiversity, landscape, soil, water, air and cultural heritage depending on the type of facility required and the location of the facility. In the longer term, recycling facilities may be able to continue to operate into the future without requiring additional land take to cater for disposal of waste if they are designed well in the first place.</p> <p>A policy to encourage recycling and composting will serve to drive waste up the waste hierarchy and potentially make more land available for housing and environmental benefit.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Economic drivers that create waste, particularly C&I waste. Requirements for new facilities to compost and recycle waste. This will in turn create uncertainty in relation to the impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, air, cultural heritage and landscape.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The policy identifies that waste management authorities are responsible for ensuring that policies and proposals are in place to deliver the targets set.</p> <p>Waste management authorities remain in place, as do the adopted waste and mineral plans which contain the targets for diversion from landfill and as such the rates of diversion following the revocation of the plan.</p> <p>The need to drive waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of municipal waste going to landfill would remain in the absence of the Plan. Therefore the effects following revocation are likely to be the same as if the policy was retained.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Rates identified in the plan and adopted waste and mineral plans will remain the same following the revocation of the plan.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Economic drivers that create waste, particularly C&I waste. Requirements for new facilities to compost and recycle waste. This will in turn create uncertainty in relation to the impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, air, cultural heritage and landscape.</p>

RS Policy W7: Waste Management Capacity and Requirements

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that Waste Planning Authorities (WPAs) will provide for an appropriate mix of development opportunities to support the waste management facilities required to achieve the targets set out in this strategy. The annual rates of waste to be managed are shown in the table within the policy and provide benchmarks for the preparation of development plan documents and annual monitoring.</p> <p>This policy identifies that waste planning authorities will be responsible for identifying new development required to meet the waste demands set out in the plan, and that consideration should be given to the type, size and mix of facilities required, taking into account, for example, that some activities will require open sites (e.g. aggregate recycling, windrow composting), whereas others, such as anaerobic digestion, will require enclosed industrial premises. The environmental impacts potentially associated with these facilities will vary across the counties, dependent on the relative proportion of waste types, and the waste management processes adopted. While the policy identifies that major new developments will meet environmental objectives there is uncertainty regarding effects due to unspecified type, scale and location of facilities required.</p> <p>At the time of the development of the plan there was an immediate and acute shortfall in the capacity required to achieve the targets that were set for recycling, composting and other forms of recovery. Allocation of suitable sites will help to address this shortfall and have a positive impact on the population and human health. Recovery of secondary aggregates will have a positive impact on material assets. Re-use and recovery of resources will have a positive impact on climate.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>The impact on biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and landscape is uncertain, but could be neutral if the majority of sites are located in areas of industrial use, on previously developed land, or within existing waste facilities (for example landfill). If extensive areas of greenfield land are required the impact would be minor adverse. There may be localised impacts on air and water quality, but these are likely to be localised resulting in a neutral to minor adverse impact.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Mitigation will be determined during the Environmental Impact Assessment process. In addition facilities would be required to meet criteria set out in their environmental permit providing further protection from significant environmental effects.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>To reach targets in the plan, new or expanded facilities will be required.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>How capacity shortfalls will be met. The generic style of this policy leads to uncertainty regarding the type, scale and location of facilities and therefore the impacts cannot be assessed fully. There is specific uncertainty regarding impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, air, cultural heritage and landscape, which may be neutral to minor, adverse.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will remove specific, county based, targets for provision of waste management facilities. In the absence of the Plan adopted waste and minerals plans will guide the targets. For those plans adopted immediately prior to, and following, adoption of the South East Plan, the targets in the plans would have been set using the Plan as guidance Plans/adopted policies for four of the ten counties (Berkshire, Kent and Medway, Oxfordshire and West Sussex) pre-date the South East Plan, and relevant consultation period by a number of years and consequently do not reflect the objectives of the SE Plan. However, Planning Policy Statement 10 sets out the Government's approach to planning for sustainable waste management. Government policy requires application of the 'waste hierarchy' of prevention, preparing for re-use, recycling, and other recovery before disposal. PPS10 also</p>		

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>requires that sufficient opportunities are provided for new waste management facilities of the right type, in the right place and at the right time. All Waste Planning Authorities (WPAs) will develop plans in accordance with PPS10. WPAs are also under a duty to co-operate across administrative boundaries with respect to strategic issues which would include the provision of waste management facilities which accept waste from more than one county. Therefore there is unlikely to be any significant change in effects as a result of revocation of the Plan.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Mitigation will be determined during the Environmental Impact Assessment process. In addition facilities would be required to meet criteria set out in their environmental permit providing further protection from significant environmental effects.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Uncertainty remains regarding the type, scale and location of facilities for those authorities without an up to date waste plan. Therefore the impacts cannot be assessed fully. There is specific uncertainty regarding impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, air, cultural heritage and landscape, which may be neutral to minor, adverse.</p>

RS Policy W8: Waste Separation

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that waste collection authorities and waste management companies should provide separate collections of recycling and compostable materials as widely and as soon as practicably possible. Households and small and medium-sized businesses should be encouraged to separate waste for collection by such schemes through information and promotional campaigns. Civic amenity sites should be organised to encourage separation of materials for re-use and recycling.</p> <p>This policy promotes recycling and composting by encouraging the provision of separate kerbside collections for different streams of waste.</p> <p>The overall objective of this policy is to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill, which is in line with national policy.</p> <p>In the UK, where there are regular kerbside collections of separated recyclable and compostable material together with bins the highest rates of recycling of municipal waste is achieved.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>That no extra vehicle trips or emissions from vehicle results from collecting different streams of waste compared to the collection of a single stream of waste.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The overall objective of Government policy on waste, as set out in the strategy for sustainable development, is to protect human health and the environment by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible. By more sustainable waste management, moving the management of waste up the 'waste hierarchy' of prevention, preparing for reuse, recycling, other recovery, and disposing only as a last resort, the Government aims to break the link between economic growth and the environmental impact of waste.</p> <p>The objectives of the policy reflect requirements of the Landfill Directive and Waste Framework Directive for waste separation which will remain in place. In addition adopted waste and mineral plans remain in place which promote the reduction of waste generation.</p> <p>The effects as a result of revocation are likely to be the same as with the South East Plan in place.</p> <p>Existing contracts set up under the Plan will be in place for the duration of their life therefore the requirement for waste separation should continue for the duration of these contracts (typically 7 years for collection and 25 years for treatment).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Waste separation will continue as waste companies have set up to receive segregated waste streams and that it will continue to be economically viable to continue operations in this way into the future.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>

RS Policy W9: New Markets

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that the regional planning body, SEEDA, Waste Resources Action Program (WRAP) and other partners will work together to establish regional and local programmes to develop markets for recycled and recovered materials and products.</p> <p>This policy identifies that work needs to be undertaken to establish markets for recycled and recovered materials.</p> <p>The policy sees that there will be benefit in the development of new markets to reduce the potential for long distance travel for products and to promote local job creation. The use of recycled material has the potential to reduce the demand on natural resources thereby having potentially beneficial outcomes for environmental factors such as biodiversity, water, soil, air and landscape. Overall the intent of the policy is to provide benefits for environmental aspects through the development of additional markets for waste materials, however there is some uncertainty related to when, and if, these markets would be developed.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Ability to develop markets will depend on many factors including market demand and quality</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>of recycled materials.</p> <p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>This policy required the working together of a number of groups to promote new markets. Some of the groups have been abolished or will not continue to exist with the revocation of the plan and the requirement for working to establish new markets in the absence of the plan may not take place.</p> <p>However, there are currently other partnerships delivering similar benefits. For example, the European Pathway to Zero Waste (EPOW), is a partnership between the Environment Agency and the Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) aimed at demonstrating the zero landfill approach in the South East of England. It includes current projects to create demand for sustainable products as well as demonstrating their value. These projects build on the Environment Agency led, Waste protocols programme in England.</p> <p>In addition, waste companies have contracts in place for the collection of materials and will have established markets for the products they produce. While it continues to be commercially viable waste companies will continue to look to develop new markets.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Encourage WRAP and EA to continue projects under EPOW to assist with new market development (current LIFE+ funding concludes March 2013).</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>If commercially viable waste companies will continue to drive to look for new markets for products.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Ability to develop markets will depend on many factors including market demand and quality of recycled materials.</p>

RS Policy W10: Regionally Significant Facilities

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that the regional planning body will work with waste authorities, the Environment Agency, SEEDA, Industry and WRAP to encourage the provision of appropriate new or expanded regional and pan-regional scale recovery and processing facilities, supported by a sub regional network of bulking and sorting facilities. This should include two strategic resource recovery parks located at or with good access to ports.</p> <p>National planning policy requires individual planning authorities to plan for waste arising in its area, and to monitor progress in delivering it. This policy recognises that greater resource recovery requires a small number of large scale specialist facilities serving larger catchments than waste planning areas or even the region as a whole.</p> <p>This policy identified that there may be the requirement for pan-regional facilities for paper and card and plastics. The policy identifies that there is the requirement for sub-regional facilities for glass, wood, tyres, electrical and electronic equipment and vehicles.</p> <p>This policy suggests that there will be the requirement for the development of large facilities and the requirement for longer distance transport to the facilities. There is the potential for negative effects on biodiversity, soils, water, air, cultural heritage and landscape through the construction of and transport to these facilities. There is the potential for positive effects on employment and material assets through recovery of waste.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA would be required for facilities where there is the potential for significant environmental effects and mitigation measures would be identified. In addition facilities would be required to</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>meet criteria set out in their environmental permit providing further protection from significant effects.</p> <p>Assumptions New facilities would be required and transport needs would increase.</p> <p>Uncertainty Where these facilities would be proposed.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Waste planning authorities, in line with Planning Policy Statement 10, will continue to plan for the management of waste in their area, and to plan for additional capacity, working together with other authorities to ensure that waste is managed in an environmentally sound manner.</p> <p>Adopted waste and mineral plans will be in place following the revocation of the Plan. These plans identify the potential need for large facilities to service waste needs.</p> <p>The duty to cooperate will assist to ensure Waste Planning Authorities work together, whilst ensuring waste is handled safely, and enabling waste to be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations.</p> <p>PPS10 identifies that all planning authorities should provide a framework for communities to take more responsibility for their own waste, and enable sufficient and timely provision of waste management facilities to meet the needs of their communities.</p> <p>Revoking the policy which identified that there may be the requirement for pan-regional facilities for paper and card and plastics and the requirement for sub-regional facilities for glass, wood, tyres, electrical and electronic equipment and vehicles, leaves uncertainty regarding the requirement for these facilities. This leads to uncertainty regarding the impacts on biodiversity, population, soil, water, air, climatic factors, cultural heritage and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures EIA would be required for facilities where there is the potential for significant environmental</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>effects and mitigation measures would be identified.</p> <p>Assumptions New facilities would be required and transport needs would increase.</p> <p>Uncertainty Where these facilities would be proposed and how cooperation will lead to siting of facilities and the scale that these facilities will be.</p>

RS Policy W11: Biomass

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that waste collection, planning and disposal authorities should encourage the separation of biomass waste, as defined in the Renewables Obligation, and consider its use as a fuel in biomass energy plants where this does not discourage recycling and composting.</p> <p>A large percentage of waste that is currently collected is green waste or wood waste which has the potential for biomass fuel. The use of biomass as a fuel has the potential to contribute to renewable energy targets. However the use of wastes as a fuel for biomass should not discourage recycling and composting.</p> <p>This policy requires the consideration of the waste as biomass fuel.</p> <p>There are potentially significant benefits for climatic factors and potential benefits for air and human health through the reduction in emissions from fossil fuel based energy sources.</p> <p>The promotion of renewable energy sources such biomass have potential adverse landscape and biodiversity effects from larger scale developments depending on the site proposed for the development.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA of the installations likely to have significant effects on the environment should address mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed any renewable energy sources with gaseous emissions will be controlled by</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															environmental permits and have no significant effects. <u>Uncertainty</u> None
Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>PPS10 identifies that all planning authorities should provide a framework for communities to take more responsibility for their own waste, and enable sufficient and timely provision of waste management facilities to meet the needs of their communities.</p> <p>Adopted waste and mineral plans provide the capacity for a range of facilities to be considered for the treatment of waste including facilities that can convert waste to energy. Therefore the potential for biomass continues, but may be less likely, following the revocation of the plan. It is considered that there continues to be positive effects for climatic factors following revocation of the Plan.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA of the installations likely to have significant effects on the environment should address mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed any renewable energy sources with gaseous emissions will be controlled by environmental permits and have no significant effects.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>

RS Policy W12: Other Recovery and Diversion Technologies

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy identifies that the regional planning body, SEEDA, the Environment Agency and the regional partners will promote and encourage the development and demonstration of anaerobic digestion and advanced recovery technologies that will be expected to make a growing contribution towards the delivery of the regional targets for recovery, diversion from landfill, and renewable energy generation over the period of the plan.</p> <p>This policy promotes the use of anaerobic digestion and other recovery technologies that can contribute to renewable energy targets. Waste development documents should look at energy from waste as part of an integrated approach to management. Any facilities established should operate to required pollution control standards and where possible combined heat and power should be incorporated into the scheme.</p> <p>Through the construction of new and large facilities there is the potential for adverse effects on biodiversity, air and landscape. Overall there should be benefits for climatic factors and material assets. Uncertainty remains around the effects on cultural heritage and will be dependent on the proposed location of facilities and the surrounding heritage assets that may be affected.</p> <p>The effect on population is likely to be positive overall through the reduction of waste going to landfill.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA required for facility where there is the potential for significant effects and mitigation measure and environmental measures will be introduced to the scheme to minimise</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															environmental effects. <u>Assumptions</u> Emissions will be controlled by permits. <u>Uncertainty</u> There is uncertainty around the scale and location of these facilities.
Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	<u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u> The overall objective of Government policy on waste, as set out in the strategy for sustainable development, is to protect human health and the environment by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible. By more sustainable waste management, moving the management of waste up the 'waste hierarchy' of prevention, preparing for reuse, recycling, other recovery, and disposing only as a last resort, the Government aims to break the link between economic growth and the environmental impact of waste. The National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure EN-3 covers the development of large scale biomass/and or waste facilities >50MW. PPS10 identifies that all planning authorities should provide a framework for communities to take more responsibility for their own waste, and enable sufficient and timely provision of waste management facilities to meet the needs of their communities. Following the revocation of the plan the adopted waste and mineral plans will remain in place. The adopted plans provide for the establishment of a range of facilities to be considered for the treatment of waste including facilities that can convert waste to energy. The effects as a result of revocation are likely to be the same as with the South East Plan in place. <u>Mitigation Measures</u> EIA required for facility where there is the potential for significant effects and mitigation measure and environmental measures will be introduced to the scheme to minimise			

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															environmental effects. <u>Assumptions</u> Emissions will be controlled by permits. <u>Uncertainty</u> There is uncertainty around the scale and location of these facilities.

RS Policy W13: Landfill Requirements

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that waste development documents should provide for continuing but declining landfill capacity. Non-inert landfill capacity should be husbanded to provide for disposal of residual non-inert waste.</p> <p>This policy puts in place that waste development documents should be prepared providing for continued landfill capacity, but that the capacity will be declining. Non-inert capacity should also be provided.</p> <p>It is identified that if the increases in recovery and diversion from landfill are achieved there is capacity in the existing landfills up to 2014, however there will be the need for additional capacity.</p> <p>There will be an overall negative effect on biodiversity and soil with the continuation of landfill facilities. The effect on cultural heritage is uncertain and depends on the location of facilities. The effects on population are uncertain due to the unknown rate at which the requirement for landfill will decline. The secondary impact of increased recovery and recycling of waste will have a positive impact on both material assets and climate.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA required for development where there is the potential for significant effects and mitigation measures and environmental measures will be introduced to the scheme to minimise environmental effects.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions Emissions will be controlled by permits.</p> <p>Uncertainty Length of time before new landfill capacity is required and location of new landfill.</p>
Revocation	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>National policy requires communities to take more responsibility for the waste they produce. However, it also recognises that it is not feasible for local authorities to be totally self-sufficient in waste management, and that some movement of waste across local authority boundaries will continue.</p> <p>The impacts of revocation of this policy remain uncertain in the short term as much will depend on the nature of individual agreements that are currently in place for the disposal of waste.</p> <p>National waste policy (Waste Strategy for England 2007, Defra) will remain in place. This policy seeks to divert waste from landfill although it does not set specific targets.</p> <p>The Landfill Directive aims to drive waste up the management hierarchy. Demanding targets have been set to reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal waste that may be landfilled. The main requirement is to achieve by 2020 a reduction in the amount of biodegradable municipal waste disposed of to land to 35% of that which was produced in 1995.</p> <p>In addition, several WPAs have policies in their respective waste local plans which seek to reduce the amount of waste for landfill.</p> <p>The Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (adopted July 2007) sets out annual landfill capacity to reflect the emerging South East Plan target. These targets state that by 2020, 84% of all waste is to be diverted from landfill.</p> <p>Surrey County Council's Waste Core Strategy (adopted May 2008) states that planning permission will be granted to enable sufficient waste management capacity to be provided to, inter alia, achieve the regional targets for recycling, composting, recovery and diversion from</p>			

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>landfill by ensuring a range of facilities is permitted (CW4).</p> <p>The East Sussex and Brighton and Hove's Waste Local Plan (adopted February 2006) contains an objective to progressively reduce the amount of waste disposed of to land. Para 5.6 continues on to state that this objective is fundamental to the strategy, and is driven by national policy and the EU Landfill Directive.</p> <p>The Berkshire Waste Local Plan (adopted Dec 1998) sets out that the local authorities will seek to phase out the use of landfill and landraising in the county area as a means of disposal of putrescible waste by 2006 (Policy WLP3).</p> <p>The Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (adopted April 2006) seeks to support recycling to move waste up the hierarchy.</p> <p>The Milton Keynes Waste Development Plan Document 2007-2026 (adopted February 2008) states that to meet regional and local waste targets and arisings to enable sufficient waste management capacity to 2026, a strategic site for a waste management facility for final treatment, and other recycling, composting and transfer activities will be provided for.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA required for development where there is the potential for significant effects and mitigation measures and environmental measures will be introduced to the scheme to minimise environmental effects.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Emissions will be controlled by permits.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Existing contracts for the disposal of waste. Length of time before new landfill capacity is required and location of new landfill.</p>

RS Policy W14: Restoration

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that development plan documents will secure high quality restoration and, where appropriate, aftercare of waste management sites so as to help deliver the wider environmental and social objectives of this Plan.</p> <p>This policy identifies the need for high quality restoration plans to help deliver wider environmental benefits. There is significant potential for environmental benefits across many aspects due to increased biodiversity, reinstatement of soil, ceasing of transport activities and landscape features.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The majority of landfill sites were former mineral quarries. Measures for restoration will be identified through the planning process and presented in a restoration management plan according to the statutory requirements for restoration and aftercare of minerals sites, as set out in the Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) 1990.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Restoration may be delayed due to reduction in waste generation leading to void space in landfills being available past originally granted operational dates.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The revocation of the policy will see no change from the current requirements for high quality restoration to be put in place.</p> <p>Existing planning permissions are in place and will require good quality restoration to be undertaken progressively following the cessation of landfilling operations, as required under the TCPA 1990.</p> <p>Good quality restoration will protect and provide benefit for aspects of the environment through ensuring environmental protection measures are in place. Management of the in place waste will protect the environment through reducing the potential for water contamination, human health will be protected through the maintenance of a cap that ensures safe access to restored areas.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures for restoration will be identified through the planning process and presented in a restoration management plan.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Restoration may be delayed due to reduction in waste generation leading to void space in landfills being available past originally granted operational dates.</p>

RS Policy W15: Hazardous and Other Specialist Waste Facilities

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that the regional planning body and the South East Regional Technical Advisory Body for waste, through the Hazardous Waste Task Group will maintain guidance on regional hazardous waste management requirements.</p> <p>This policy requires the Hazardous Waste Task Group, maintain guidance on regional waste management requirements.</p> <p>Provision will be required for a small number of large scale specialist facilities for hazardous waste streams. Waste development documents should identify a range of sites and/or criteria for the determination of large scale specialist facilities.</p> <p>The effects of this policy are assessed as neutral as the policy relates to the preparation of guidance, with the guidance on its own having no effects on environmental aspects.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Revocation of this policy will have no impact on the overall effects assessed as the policy related to the preparation of guidance.</p> <p>Waste planning authorities, in line with Planning Policy Statement 10, will continue to plan for the management of hazardous waste in their area, and to plan for additional capacity, working together with other authorities to ensure that such waste is managed in an environmentally sound manner.</p> <p>One of the core planning principles of the NPPF is for there to be joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. Therefore there will continue to be planning for facilities that are required to service regional requirements.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None</p>

RS Policy W16: Waste Transport Infrastructure

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that waste development documents should identify infrastructure facilities, including sites for waste transfer and bulking facilities, essential for the sustainable transport of waste materials. These sites and facilities should be safeguarded in local development documents. Policies should aim to reduce transport and associated impacts of waste movement. Use of rail and water-borne transport with appropriate depot and wharf provision should be encouraged wherever possible, particularly for large facilities.</p> <p>Policy is about the provision of sites that would lead to sustainable waste transport. These sites and facilities should be safeguarded in local development documents. The use of rail and water-borne transport are also encouraged.</p> <p>The policy should lead to positive benefits for the population, air and climatic factors. The effects on other environmental factors will be very dependent on the nature and location of the development and for this reason the effects are uncertain for the water environment biodiversity values, cultural heritage and landscape. The effects on soil are likely to be neutral as the waterways and rail networks are most probably established and therefore there is unlikely to be a supplementary adverse effect on the soil environment resulting from land take.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA required for development where there is the potential for significant effects and mitigation measures and environmental measures will be introduced to the scheme to minimise environmental effects.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty There could be uncertainty around effects based on type of transport proposed and the location.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation The revocation of the plan is unlikely to see a change in the approach to identifying sustainable methods of transport being used when feasible.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures EIA required for development where there is the potential for significant effects and mitigation measures and environmental measures will be introduced to the scheme to minimise environmental effects.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty There could be uncertainty around effects based on type of transport proposed and the location.</p>

RS Policy W17: Location of Waste Management Facilities

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that waste development documents will, when identifying locations for waste management facilities, give priority to safeguarding and expanding suitable sites with an existing waste management use and good transport connections.</p> <p>Waste management facilities should not be precluded from the Green Belt. Small-scale waste management facilities for local needs should not be precluded from Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Parks where the development would not compromise the objectives of the designation.</p> <p>National planning policy requires individual planning authorities to plan for waste arising in its area, and to monitor progress in delivering it.</p> <p>This policy identifies that locations for waste management facilities will be safeguarded and suitable sites with an existing waste management use and good transport connections should be expanded where appropriate.</p> <p>The policy identifies that siting of facilities can be in an AONB but should not compromise the designation. Given the policy requirement for protection of the objectives of the designation, there is unlikely to be any adverse environmental impacts arising. However, Green Belt may be used and this could give rise to adverse impacts on biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and landscape, dependent on the extent and location of land take. The effect on these aspects is uncertain, potentially ranging from neutral to minor adverse.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>The provision of appropriate waste management facilities which include provision for recycling of secondary aggregates and resources would have a positive impact on material assets, climate and the population (through material reuse, reduced primary energy used in product manufacture such as cement and secondary benefits to the population from reduced risks from waste disposal).</p> <p>The policy requires that sites should have good accessibility and transport connections which could reduce aerial emissions from transport. However, there may be emissions to air from a number of types of waste facilities, including dusts and odours. The overall effect on air quality is uncertain and could be minor positive, neutral or minor negative.</p> <p>Some processes produce contaminated waste water, and the impact on water quality will depend on the treatment options implemented, and the sensitivity of receiving water courses. The impact is assessed to be uncertain, but likely to be neutral to minor negative.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA required for development where there is the potential for significant effects and mitigation measures and environmental measures will be introduced to the scheme to minimise environmental effects. Facilities will be required to operate under the conditions of their Environmental Permit thereby minimising the potential for significant effects.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The generic style of this policy leads to uncertainty regarding the type, scale and location of facilities and therefore the impacts cannot be assessed fully. There is specific uncertainty regarding impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, cultural heritage and landscape, which may be neutral to minor, adverse. The impact on air may be minor positive, neutral or minor adverse.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>National planning policy requires individual planning authorities to plan for waste arising in its area, and to monitor progress in delivering it. Waste planning authorities are required to</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>identify suitable areas for new or enhanced waste management facilities (PPS10, paragraph 17) and, in doing this, to consider <i>inter alia</i> opportunities for on-site management of waste and for co-location of waste management facilities (PPS10, paragraph 20). The capacity of existing and potential transport infrastructure is an important consideration in assessing a site's suitability for sustainable movement of waste (paragraph 21).</p> <p>The NPPF provides the planning policy framework for Green Belt land (section 9). Once Green Belt boundaries have been established they should only be altered in exceptional circumstances (paragraph 83). There is a presumption against development in Green Belt except in 'very special circumstances' (paragraph 87). Exceptions may include sites for mineral extraction (paragraph 90), but do not include waste. Planning Policy Statement 10 requires waste planning authorities to protect the Green Belt but recognise the locational needs of some facilities when defining detailed boundaries. Therefore any siting of waste management facilities in Green Belt is unlikely but any which does occur would reduce the potential adverse impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape. However, green field sites, outside of Green Belt, could be used and the impact on these aspects is uncertain, between neutral to minor negative The impacts of revocation are the same as for retention of the policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA is required for development where there is the potential for significant effects and mitigation measures and environmental measures will be introduced to the scheme to minimise environmental effects. Facilities will be required to operate under the conditions of their Environmental Permit thereby minimising the potential for significant effects.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>There is specific uncertainty regarding impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, cultural heritage and landscape, which may be neutral to minor, adverse. The impact on air may be minor positive, neutral or minor adverse.</p>

RS Policy M1: Sustainable Construction

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy requires planning authorities, construction industry and other stakeholders to encourage sustainable construction practices. Constraints on the use of primary aggregates and greater use of recycled/secondary minerals will have a beneficial effect on mineral reserves in the medium to long term. Greater recovery of building materials from construction sites will reduce disposal requirement and have a beneficial effect on remaining landfill capacity.</p> <p>Reducing delivery distances will have a positive impact on air quality and climate.</p> <p>Delivery of a high standard of restoration will have a beneficial effect on biodiversity, landscape and soils.</p> <p>The provision of both primary and secondary aggregates for development will provide significant benefits to the population.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															None
Revocation	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The NPPF sets out guidelines for facilitating the sustainable use of minerals (section 13). Whilst acknowledging that minerals are essential to support sustainable economic growth, it states the importance of making best use of them to secure their long-term conservation (para 142). Local authorities are required (para. 143) to ‘take account of the contribution that substitute or secondary and recycled materials and minerals waste would make to the supply of materials, before considering extraction of primary materials..’ In addition paragraphs 143 and 144 provide strong protection for the natural and historic environment, human health and important landscapes.</p> <p>Paragraph 145 of the NPPF sets out national policy for aggregates. It requires each minerals planning authority to prepare a local aggregate based assessment based on average sales, which gives local authorities greater control over how much mineral extraction they need to plan for, and how this should be provided. This includes secondary, recycled and marine sources. Technical advice will still be provided through Aggregate Working Parties, and the duty to co-operate should assist in ensuring mineral planning authorities work together with the industry to ensure that a steady and adequate supply of minerals is provided in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>The policies set out in the NPPF would provide similar objectives to the South East Plan and revocation of this policy is likely to have neutral impact.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None</p>

RS Policy M2: Recycled and Secondary Aggregates

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy, which increases the target for use of secondary aggregates and recycled materials from 29% to 34% by 2016, would assist in conserving primary mineral resources and would therefore have a significant positive impact on material assets.</p> <p>Greater use of secondary aggregates will reduce the dependency on material assets which, in turn, would reduce the requirement for excavation and would have a potentially positive impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Construction and demolition (C&D) activity is not adversely impacted by economic conditions, and an adequate number of mineral recycling facilities are provided to process C&D waste.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Paragraph 145 of the NPPF requires each Minerals Planning Authority (MPA) to prepare an annual Local Aggregate Assessment which needs to include an assessment of all supply</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>options, including marine dredged, secondary and recycled sources. Emphasis on increasing the use of recycled and secondary aggregates is also in line with the overall objective of Government policy with respect to sustainable waste management (PPS10) which is to ‘...protect human health and the environment by producing less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible’.</p> <p>Uncertainty remains around the extent to which individual MPAs aim to achieve the specific targets set. Two of the authorities (Isle of Wight and Surrey) have adopted plans which include targets derived from the South East Plan, and a further five authorities (East Sussex/Brighton and Hove; Hampshire/Portsmouth/Southampton/New Forest; Kent; Medway and Oxfordshire) have draft plans which reflect the requirements of South East Plan policy M2. The remaining five authorities (Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Milton Keynes and West Sussex) have adopted plans and saved policies which pre-date the Plan.</p> <p>While the draft adopted plans reference the Plan, there are examples of targets which do not reflect policy M2, for example Hampshire policy 17 (Aggregate supply) which predicts that 1.0 mtpa of the aggregate supply will be from recycled and secondary materials. This compares with the policy requirement for 1.7 mtpa.</p> <p>The national policy context is for increased use of secondary and recycled aggregates and this will result in a positive impact on material assets. In view of the uncertainty around specific targets for some of the authorities, a significant positive impact is predicted in the longer term for material assets and associated positive impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape are predicted for the medium to long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>MPAs adopt similar targets for use of secondary materials to those within the South East Plan.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Light Green	Light Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Light Green	Light Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Light Green	Light Green	<p><u>Uncertainty</u> See above.</p>

RS Policy M3: Primary Aggregates

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	-	-	?	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	?	Likely Significant Effects of Retention This policy establishes that the supply of construction aggregates should be met from an increased supply of secondary and recycled materials, a reduced contribution from land-won reserves and an increase in imports from marine won sand and gravel. A total target for land won sand and gravel of 13.25 million tonnes (mt) per annum is established for the region, with sub-regional apportionment. A target for crushed stone (2.2 mt per annum) is also set. Sources of marine-based aggregates are generally replenished over time by natural processes of coastal erosion and sediment drift. Terrestrial deposits are finite. Emphasis within the policy on increasing the supply of secondary/recycled materials will reduce reliance on primary sources, resulting in a positive impact on material assets in the medium to longer term, as the proportion of secondary materials increases. xcavation of primary aggregates from terrestrial sources will have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape, and may have an adverse impact on cultural heritage, dependent on the relative location of areas of historic/archaeological interest. In addition, a greater reliance on marine-dredged aggregates could have an adverse impact on marine and coastal biodiversity. It is concluded that the effect on terrestrial ,biodiversity, soils and landscape is adverse in the short to medium term but could improve in the longer term as a high standard of restoration is required (M1). The processes involved in mineral extraction, involve use of water resources for terrestrial extraction. Marine extraction requires disturbance of sediments which may release

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>contaminants into the water column. The effect on water quality would be minor adverse.</p> <p>MPAs have been set targets for production although these have been based on a review of past rates of production, rather than on an appraisal of future needs. Consequently while it would normally be expected that there would be a significant benefit to the population arising from use of construction materials in housing etc. this is concluded to be minor rather than major, as there is residual uncertainty regarding need when compared with the targets.</p> <p>Any impacts on air quality and climate are dependent on transport routes which will be modified to include importation of marine-dredged aggregates, and are considered to be uncertain.</p> <p>The supporting text to the policy refers to an ongoing review of the targets. Revised, lower, targets were proposed (11.12 mt per annum sand and gravel, and 1.44 mt per annum crushed rock) and, following public examination, these proposed changes were circulated for consultation between 19th March 2010 to 1st June 2010. They were not adopted as the Regional Strategy was revoked on 6th July 2010. Although slightly lower, the impacts associated with these changes are assessed as being the same as for the published policy.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Statutory protection exists for wildlife sites of national and international importance. Other plan policies, e.g. M1, require a high standard of restoration.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Requirement for primary materials to meet development needs. Transport methods for marine-won minerals and contribution to air emissions. Location of new sites and extensions in relation to areas of historic/archaeological interest. Long term, potentially positive, impact of restoration on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Revocation	-	-	?	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Paragraph 145 of the NPPF sets out obligations on the MPA in order to plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates. These include the preparation of an annual Local Aggregate Assessment and an assessment of supply options (including marine dredged). There is an obligation to make provision for land banks of at least 7 years for sand and gravel.</p> <p>The requirements of the NPPF are broad ranging and require regular review.</p> <p>Two of the MPAs have adopted minerals plans. The Surrey adopted plan makes provision for 24 million tonnes of aggregates between 2009 and 2026, providing an average of 1.41 mtpa which is considerably lower than the policy (M3) apportionment of 2.62 mtpa. 2.62 mtpa was considered to be unrealistic in the adopted plan, and the Secretary of State also recommended a reduction in the target (Proposed changes published by SoS in March 2010).</p> <p>The Hampshire Minerals Waste Plan is in draft form but Policy 17 (Aggregate Supply – Capacity and Source) states that an adequate and steady supply of aggregates will be provided at a rate of 1.56 mtpa. This is lower than the South East Plan target of 2.63 mtpa. East Sussex, Brighton and Hove, intends to supply 0.1 mtpa, higher than the original 0.01 mtpa in the South East Plan while Oxfordshire (Policy M2) makes provision for 1.89 mtpa of sand, gravel and crushed rock, in line with the South East Plan target of 1.82 mtpa.</p> <p>Policies within the emerging and adopted plans make reference to marine-won resources where relevant (e.g. Hampshire).</p> <p>Sites with existing consents will continue to operate in a manner consistent with the planning requirements accompanying the consent, as would be the case for retention of the policy. There is variation within the adopted and emerging plans from the targets within M3, and therefore some uncertainty regarding the overall production and rate. However, the supporting text to M3 made clear that the apportionment within the policy was under review. Review of resources and supply will be an ongoing process, irrespective of whether the RS policy is revoked. Consequently it is anticipated that the overall objectives of the policy will be met following revocation with similar associated impacts.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures Statutory protection exists for wildlife sites of national and international importance.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Extent of requirement for primary aggregates to meet development needs.</p>

RS Policy M4: Other Minerals

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary	
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L		
	-	-	?	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy establishes the requirement for clay, chalk, silica, sand and gypsum as regionally significant minerals of national importance and sets the permitted reserves which MPAs should plan for. This would have a positive impact on the economic businesses reliant on these minerals, for example cement manufacture and high specification glass manufacture, and also on the population benefitting from construction.</p> <p>There is sufficient permitted supply, or identified reserves, for the majority of these significant minerals during the plan period, although there may be a need for extensions to existing sites.</p> <p>Extraction potentially has a negative impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape although Policy M1 requires restoration to a high standard. The longer term impact on these environmental aspects is uncertain.</p> <p>Extraction may also have a negative impact on cultural heritage dependent on the proximity of locations of historic/archaeological interest to areas of extraction. Extraction sites would be designed to minimise impacts and the overall impact is assessed as uncertain.</p> <p>The policy requires the development of new handling facilities to increase transport by rail or water. This would reduce dependency on road transport and potentially have a positive impact on air quality and climate although this would depend on the construction of such facilities. It is envisaged that the policy would have a neutral impact on air quality and climate in the short term to medium term but that quality would improve in the long term.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policy M1</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Some extension to existing, consented, extractions is required.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Traffic implications depend on the construction of facilities to facilitate transport by rail or water. Extent of additional land take required beyond that with existing planning consent.</p>
Revocation	-	-	?	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	?				<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Two MPAs in the region have adopted plans (Isle of Wight and Surrey). There is a requirement in policy M4 for Surrey to provide a permitted reserve of silica. Policy MC8 of the plan identifies the preferred location for this reserve, in accordance with national policy at the time of drafting. The Plans for other named authorities with strategic reserves of 'other minerals' are in draft/consultation and therefore the detail of their allocation remains uncertain.</p> <p>Mineral Planning Authorities (MPAs) are under a duty to co-operate on strategic issues, such as minerals provision, which cross administrative boundaries. The NPPF provides the framework for minerals and, at paragraph 143, requires that resources of local and national importance are not sterilised by non-mineral development. Paragraph 146 requires MPAs to plan for a steady and adequate supply of industrial materials. A similar stock of permitted reserves for silica sand and brick clay is required by both the South East Plan and the NPPF. The NPPF has a lower minimum requirement for chalk and limestone, and contains no guidance on gypsum.</p> <p>In view of the NPPF minerals planning policy framework (contained within the technical guidance to the NPPF), and the duty to co-operate, similar positive impacts are predicted for the population as would be achieved by the South East Plan. The NPPF also promotes the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>implementation of sustainable transport policies but the extent to which these would mirror the South East Plan policy which specifically encourages water/rail transport is uncertain.</p> <p>Similar impacts are predicted although the effect on air and climatic factors is uncertain.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>NPPF requires that, in granting planning permission for mineral development, there are no unacceptable adverse environmental impacts (paragraph 144).</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Some extension to existing, consented, extractions is required</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Transport policies and impact on air and climate. Extent of additional land take required beyond that with existing planning consent.</p>

RS Policy M5: Safeguarding of Mineral Reserves, Wharves and Rail Depots

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires that wharf and rail facilities should be safeguarded for handling and distribution of imported minerals and processed materials and protected from inappropriate development. The protection of existing sites will reduce any requirement for new sites which will have a beneficial impact on biodiversity, soil, and landscape. Making provision for facilities to handle imported minerals will reduce the pressure on terrestrial material assets. Use of rail for mineral transport is likely to reduce adverse impacts on air quality and climate.</p> <p>The wharf and rail facilities will be used to ensure provision of minerals for construction and will have a significant impact on economic growth and population.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF (para. 143) requires the local planning authority to safeguard existing, planned and potential rail heads, rail links to quarries, wharfage and associated storage, handling and processing facilities for the bulk transport by rail, sea or waterways of minerals, including</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>recycled, secondary and marine-dredged materials. This is a similar form of safeguarding as contained within the South East Plan and therefore the impacts of revocation are predicted to be the same as for implementation of the South East Plan.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures N/A</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty None</p>

RS Policy C1: The New Forest National Park

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Placing a high priority on the conservation and enhancement of land, together with its specific character, in the New Forest National Park will provide significant benefits to biodiversity, landscape and, through recreational opportunities, to human health. The development of sustainable land management policies will benefit soil quality and may also improve water quality and storage, and improve carbon holding capacity of soil, thereby having a positive impact on climate. An emphasis on small scale, sustainable, development will protect air quality, and, when combined with the carbon storage effect gained from soil improvement, will result in a positive impact on air quality. The overall policy will have a significant positive impact on cultural heritage.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The policy extends beyond the boundary of the New Forest National Park, to encourage co-operation between the local authority and others to develop sustainable land management policies, including protection of grazing, to support the purposes of the National Park. The achievement of this objective will depend on the co-operation indicated.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+		+	+	+

RS Policy C2: The South Downs

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy relates to the protection which would be afforded to the South Downs National Park, if designated, such that the purposes of the designation would be a material consideration in planning decisions. The designation recognises the natural beauty of the area and space for recreation (nb the South Downs National Park became fully operational in April 2011).</p> <p>Consequently this policy would have a significant beneficial impact on landscape, cultural heritage and also on the health of those using the area for recreational activities. Protection of the area will seek to encourage the integrated use of land to provide multiple environmental benefits. These will include improvements to biodiversity, soil quality, flood control and carbon sequestration which, in turn, will benefit air quality and climate.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures N/A</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty As above</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The South Downs National Park designation is now effective and the area is provided</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
				+	+	+																									<p>statutory protection. The South Downs National Plan sets out the aims as being: protection, conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the South Downs; promotion of opportunities for the understanding and quiet enjoyment of the area's special qualities and the encouragement of sustainable forms of economic and community development.</p> <p>In addition the NPPF policies within section 11 place a high level of emphasis on the conservation of landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks (115). There should be the same level of protection afforded and consequently a significant benefit to landscape, cultural heritage and to human health.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures N/A</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty None</p>

RS Policy C3: Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>High priority is given to the conservation and enhancement of 11 designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in the region. Any development should be small scale and sustainably located. The policy will have significant benefits to landscape and cultural heritage and there will also be a positive impact on biodiversity. AONBs provide open space for recreation and amenity which will have a significant positive effect on human health.</p> <p>The AONBs have a range of characteristics but management will seek to encourage integrated and sustainable use of land which will have a positive impact on soil, and will also benefit water storage and flood protection. Improved soil condition is likely to increase carbon storage potential with a consequential beneficial impact on air quality and climate.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>In those AONBs which abut the coastline planning authorities are encouraged to protect areas of land between high and low water, which are not included within the AONB boundary. Currently these areas do not have the same extent of protection.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>AONBs are statutorily protected and managed for the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty and local authorities are required to prepare management plans (The Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000).</p> <p>Paragraph 115 of the NPPF accords AONBs with the same level of landscape protection as National Parks. It is expected that there will be similar benefits to landscape, biodiversity, human health, cultural heritage, soil, water and climate following revocation of the plan if the plan is revoked.</p> <p>However, where AONB's abut the coastline, the policy encourages planning authorities to work to protect nationally designated landscapes to the low water mark. Currently the designations extend to the high water mark. Following revocation it is uncertain whether this objective would be given priority by planning authorities which leaves some uncertainty regarding the impact on landscape at these margins. The overall impact on landscape will be either minor or significantly positive.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>National legislative protection for biodiversity would mitigate against damage to biodiversity along coast lines between high and low water.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The extent to which areas outside the AONB boundary in coastal areas (between high and low tide) would be afforded protection is uncertain.</p>

RS Policy C4: Landscape and Countryside Management

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy seeks to encourage positive and high quality management of the region's open countryside, and, through landscape character assessment, protect the landscape. This will provide a benefit to the landscape and will enhance the well being of humans. The use of agri-environmental funding and other management tools is encouraged, particularly around London. The use of such schemes would have a positive impact on biodiversity, and would assist in protection of soil. Appropriate management of these schemes would also have a positive impact on drainage and water quality and, potentially, on climate change by reducing emissions from high intensity farming practices.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The policy is aspirational and partly dependent on other bodies, eg participation of land owners in agri-environmental funding schemes. It is unclear how successful this policy would be in achieving its objectives.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Section 11 of the NPPF requires local authorities to 'contribute to and enhance the natural</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p><i>and local environment</i>', including the protection of valued landscapes and recognition of the wider benefits of ecosystem services (as would be provided, for example, by use of agri-environmental schemes).</p> <p>The NPPF policy is similar in aspirations to RS policy C4 and therefore the potential impacts of revocation are predicted to be the same as for retention.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> The policy is aspirational and partly dependent on other bodies, eg participation of land owners in agri-environmental funding schemes. It is unclear how successful this policy would be in achieving its objectives.</p>

RS Policy C5: Managing the Rural – Urban Fringe

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy seeks to ensure a sustainable multifunctional rural-urban fringe, including Green Belt, complying with 10 key functions and including the identification of areas potentially subject to dereliction. This is to be achieved by working with neighbouring planning authorities and partners, and by targeting areas where urban extensions are planned.</p> <p>This policy will provide benefit to landscape and biodiversity and, by improving opportunities for recreation, will benefit human health. Positive management of soils for biodiversity, and enhancement of derelict areas will have a positive impact on soil quality. Flood protection measures can be integrated into such areas and would have a positive impact on water management. The 10 key functions include a role in sustainable waste management, which would have a positive effect on material assets, and enhancement of the cultural legacy which would impact positively on cultural heritage.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures N/A</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>A core planning principle of the NPPF is the multifunctional use of open land (e.g. for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, carbon storage, food production (paragraph 17).</p> <p>The NPPF also requires local authorities to positively 'enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt' e.g. <i>inter alia</i> for recreation, landscape, visual amenity. The Localism Act places a duty on local authorities to co-operate with neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>The NPPF provides supportive policies to deliver green infrastructure and also continues to support appropriate recreational uses within the urban fringe (with benefits to biodiversity and the population and health).</p> <p>While the policy framework to achieve the objectives of the South East Plan policy exists, the focus on the urban fringe is less clear than in the South East Plan. The emphasis in the NPPF on neighbourhood planning should help to ensure that the principles embodied in the NPPF are targeted towards those areas of the rural-urban fringe which would benefit most. Consequently the positive impacts on biodiversity, landscape, human health, soil, water, material assets and cultural heritage would be unaffected by revocation of the South East Plan.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>The core NPPF principles are focused on the urban fringe as much as they are for other areas.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>See above.</p>

RS Policy C6: Countryside Access and Rights of Way Management

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy seeks to encourage access to the countryside while managing access to sites of international importance for wildlife (Natura 2000 and Ramsar) in order to protect them from adverse impact (e.g. from recreation and impaired air quality). This will have a beneficial effect on human health as a consequence of improving recreational access to the countryside, and also provides benefit to biodiversity.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF (para 75) sets out that planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access and that local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users. Access to the countryside is also a core ambition of the Government White Paper 2011 'The Natural Choice, which sets out (Chapter 4) the aspiration to 'strengthen the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p><i>connections between people and nature</i>'. The NPPF also provides Ramsar sites the same level of protection as European sites (para. 118). These policies will promote beneficial effects on biodiversity and human health.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> None</p>

RS Policy C7: The River Thames Corridor

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Establishment of a co-ordinated policy framework for the River Thames Corridor would provide benefit to landscape, townscape and cultural heritage. The provision of river side recreation would have a beneficial impact on human health. Regeneration of redundant land and buildings would have a positive impact on soil quality. The policy is likely to result in improvements to water quality within the Thames.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF, para 165, requires that planning policies and decisions are based on 'up to date information about the natural environment and other characteristics of the area including drawing, for example, from River Basin Management Plans'. The Thames River Basin Management Plan, published in 2009, focuses on the protection, improvement and sustainable use of the water environment. Planning authorities are actively involved in the Thames River Basin District Liaison Panel. Other policies within the NPPF seek to enhance</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>the historic urban environment including implementation of landscape character assessments where appropriate.</p> <p>The existing River Basin Management Plan will provide improvements to biodiversity and water quality and benefit to human health. The South East Plan policy integrates a number of aspects of river corridor management, including issues relating to townscape. The NPPF covers these issues but as separate items and there is a risk, initially, that the elements will not be completely integrated throughout the Thames basin. Therefore there may be a short delay in achieving the co-ordinated improvements in landscape, cultural heritage, material assets and soil, although these should be achieved in the medium to long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Timescale for co-ordinated approach to landscape, cultural heritage, material assets and soil.</p>

RS Policy BE1: Management of an Urban Renaissance

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy provides a generic framework for local plans to deliver improvements to the built environment in order to enhance quality of life, focusing on: governance; design excellence; economic strength; environmental responsibility and social well being and inclusion.</p> <p>The creation of attractive urban environments will benefit the population and human health. Efficient use of land for development should contribute to sustainable use of soil by reducing the amount of land take. Sensitive re-use of historic buildings should have a positive impact on cultural heritage. Provision of green infrastructure will benefit biodiversity. All other effects are considered to be neutral.</p> <p>As this policy relates to new development which will be subject to planning approval, the benefits predicted from the policy would be achieved within the medium to long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The policy is generic and high level. Impacts will be dependent on local decisions and a matter for local authorities in their own plan making.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Achieving quality of the built environment is one of the core principles of the planning system. Section 7 of the NPPF is devoted to 'good design' and, taken in conjunction with other policies in the NPPF should minimise the potential adverse effects of development. The policies will apply to new development requiring planning consent and therefore positive impacts on biodiversity, population, soil, cultural heritage and landscape are predicted in the medium to long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>As with retention of the policy, the effects of revocation would be dependent on local plans and decisions.</p>

RS Policy BE2: Suburban Intensification

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	0	?	?	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	Likely Significant Effects of Retention This policy seeks to achieve clear planning and design guidance for suburban intensification and cross references to policies SP2 (Regional Hubs) and SP3 (Urban Focus and Urban Renaissance). The clear identification of locations where development could be intensified, making best use of existing transport infrastructure and areas of underutilised development, would potentially reduce the development pressure on other land, thereby providing environmental benefit to: biodiversity, soil and landscape. However, development intensification in urban areas could have a negative impact on biodiversity, dependent on green space management and consequently the impact is assessed as uncertain. An approach which is planned is likely to provide positive benefit to townscape. A focus on more development around public transport nodes would reduce traffic emissions which would be of benefit to air quality, climate and human health. These benefits would be realised on implementation of the development plans, in the medium to longer term. Further development and use of construction materials would have an adverse effect on material assets. Mitigation Measures N/A Assumptions None

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Assumes that the identification of such locations is feasible and implemented.</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF promotes sustainable development and requires authorities to set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in the area. Other NPPF policies include the effective use of land by re-use; and the adoption of sustainable transport modes of transport.</p> <p>As there will still be a need for housing and suburban intensification, implementation of these policies should have a similar outcome to the South East Plan. However, as the NPPF does not provide specific spatial outcomes, there is no certainty that individual authorities would approach this issue in the same way. Consequently the impacts on biodiversity, population, soil, air quality, climate, material assets and landscape are assessed as uncertain in the medium to long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The South East Plan makes a clear requirement for the identification of key locations and positive planning for development. Key locations are not identified in the NPPF, although the principles of sustainable suburban intensification are implicit. The lack of spatial definition, particularly for the 47 (of 68) local authorities without an adopted plan which conforms with the South East Plan, leaves some uncertainty regarding the locations and extent of development.. together with associated impacts.</p>		

RS Policy BE3: Suburban Renewal

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires the identification of suburban areas in need of renewal, and subsequent preparation of Neighbourhood Management Plans (NMPs) which provide a framework for improvements in community service, environmental quality and infrastructure. Provision of these improvements would provide significant positive benefit to the population and townscape. There may also be some positive impact on biodiversity, dependent on the extent of green space provision.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Following the Government reforms neighbourhoods are encouraged to take the lead in preparing neighbourhood plans which should be aligned in a strategic sense with the Local Plan, but which also shape and direct sustainable development in the area. Theoretically this should lead to similar benefits to local population, townscape and biodiversity, however there is some uncertainty regarding whether the neighbourhoods which are most in need, will</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>become involved in the neighbourhood planning process. Consequently the impacts on population, townscape and biodiversity are assessed as uncertain.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> It is assumed that the local authority publishes its strategic plan in a timely manner (as required by the NPPF) and that the concept of 'neighbourhood' plans is one that is taken up by the public.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> Uncertainty exists as to whether the neighbourhoods that would have been targeted by the South East Plan policy would become involved in the preparation of neighbourhood plans.</p>

RS Policy BE4: The Role of Small Rural Towns ('Market Towns')

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy seeks to strengthen the viability of small rural towns. The policy will have a significant impact on the population by providing housing and local employment. By implementing measures to protect and enhance the character and appearance of small towns it would also improve the townscape. Development of public transport networks would reduce vehicle emissions and have a positive effect on air quality and climatic factors.</p> <p>The provision of housing will use construction materials and would have a negative impact on material assets.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>High level generic policy with no spatial boundaries set. Development of public transport networks may be aspirational but not achievable.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF sets out in section 3 the requirement for Local Plans to support a prosperous rural community. Local plans will also be guided by a number of Government policies and guidance which relate to promoting healthy communities, supporting a prosperous rural economy and</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	<p>sustainable transport (e.g. Delivering Sustainable Transport Solutions for Housing Growth). Plans based on this guidance should have similar environmental benefits although the effects may be delayed pending plan production.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty None</p>

RS Policy BE5: Village Management

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy to provide small scale affordable housing, business and service development in villages to meet local needs would provide social and economic benefit to the local population. The townscape should be protected and improved by the requirement for development to comply with rigorous design and sustainability criteria.</p> <p>There may be local increases in traffic which could have localised adverse impact on air quality and climate but any impact would be negligible in a regional context. If development occurs on existing green field land this would have an adverse impact on biodiversity. The scale of development is likely to be small and therefore the impact on use of material assets would be negligible.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Biodiversity impacts could be mitigated by appropriate offsetting schemes. Minor changes in traffic, and consequential impacts on air quality, could be mitigated by implementation of an appropriate transport strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary					
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L						
Revocation	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF makes provision for housing in rural areas, to reflect local needs, and based on affordable housing with possible allowance of market housing (para 54). Both the South East Plan and the NPPF refer to 'local needs', but the NPPF would permit some market housing in order to facilitate provision of affordable housing. This could result in marginally more development than would be permitted under the South East Plan.</p> <p>The extent of housing in rural areas will also be guided by neighbourhood plans (para. 183 185 NPPF) which will allow communities to establish local housing needs provided these are in general conformity with strategic objectives for the area. Once a neighbourhood plan is in force it will take precedence over existing non-strategic policies.</p> <p>There would be a positive benefit to the local population in the provision of additional housing. The requirement for good design (section 7) should ensure that townscape is protected. In addressing local community needs, some additional development may be identified which if permitted may require development land and which could have a limited minor adverse impact on local biodiversity.</p> <p>In the short term there will be some uncertainty regarding policy as new plans are prepared. The impacts would take effect in the medium to long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Possible mitigations for any biodiversity impacts would include implementation of offsetting schemes.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The extent to which the NPPF policy would lead to greater development within villages than predicted by the South East Plan policy.</p>

RS Policy BE6: Management of the Historic Environment

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires local authorities to adopt policies to protect, conserve and enhance the historic environment, providing the highest level of protection to internationally and nationally designated historic assets. Encouragement is given to regeneration of redundant, under-used buildings.</p> <p>A significant positive impact on cultural heritage would be expected, together with a positive impact on townscape. Improved cultural heritage also provides enhanced economic and social benefits which impact positively on the population.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The policy is generic and high level. The impact of the policy will depend on local plans and implementation.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Legislation protecting listed buildings, scheduled monuments, conservation areas and registered parks and gardens remain in place.</p> <p>The NPPF, section 12, replaces PPS5 (Planning for the Historic Environment) and sets out</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>the policy framework for conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through 'neglect, decay or other threats'.</p> <p>Paragraphs 126 - 141 of the NPPF set out strong national policy on conserving and enhancing the historic environment. It states that local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats.</p> <p>When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.</p> <p>While the regional strategy identified significant historic features and sites in South East England, given the content of local plans and the policies set out in the NPPF, it is unlikely that the revocation of policy BE 6 would remove the protection afforded to these assets and it is unlikely that revocation of this policy would have any effects.</p> <p>Impacts on the population, cultural heritage and townscape would be similar to those achieved by the South East Plan policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures N/A</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty None</p>

RS Policy TC1: Strategic Network of Town Centres

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies 22 Primary Regional Centres and 27 Secondary Regional Centres. In addition 12 towns are identified as 'Centres for Significant Change'. These are expected to undergo the most significant change and to be Regional Hubs with a focus on significant growth.</p> <p>The principal aims for these Regional Centres and Regional Hubs are considered later within the regional strategy alongside specific priorities for them. The assessment of sub- regional policies is provided below.</p> <p>As they envisage significant sub-regional growth and development for the local economies, capitalising on strengths, it is anticipated that the benefits from housing and employment provision will be significant on population. For the other topics the effects for each topic will range between positive and negative depending on the policy and sub-region and as such each has been recorded as uncertain for this policy. Please refer to the individual sub-regional policy assessments for further details.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															Variation according to policy and sub-region.
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u> As above – see sub-regional policies below.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> As for retention</p>

RS Policy TC2: New Development and Redevelopment in Town Centres

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
Retention	0	?	?	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy provides guidance to local authorities in preparation of development plan documents, and pending review of the South East Plan. It focuses development and re-development into town centres. Local authorities are advised to carry our further work, and to work jointly with other local authorities, to determine the need for additional floor space in town centres and establish a vision and strategy for centres. The policy guides the priority for development with the most occurring in Centres for Significant Change (Regional Hubs), then Primary Regional Centres, with less growth in Secondary Regional Centres.</p> <p>This policy will assist in the regeneration of town centres and will have a significant positive impact on the economy and population. This should have a positive impact on townscape and will benefit cultural heritage. Promotion of public transport will reduce reliance on the car. The effect on air quality and climate is uncertain and is dependent on the extent of additional transport generated by the increased development.</p> <p>Increased waste arisings, together with use of aggregates for construction, will have a negative impact on material assets.</p> <p>There could be an adverse impact on biodiversity if green spaces are used for development although this may be offset by careful planning and integration of green space within developed areas. The impact on biodiversity is assessed as uncertain. There is likely to be a benefit to soil quality through remediation of contaminated or derelict sites.</p> <p>The policy is advisory and is dependent on authorities carrying out further assessment of town centre floor space requirements hence the timescale for implementation would be medium to</p>		

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Identification, development and implementation of green infrastructure into new development (NRM5) Measures to reduce air pollution (NRM9).</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty This policy is for guidance, pending review of the South East Plan. The extent to which local authorities rely on this guidance is uncertain.</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Paragraph 22 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should identify priority areas for economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement, while paragraph 23 states that planning policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments and set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period. Local planning authorities should, for example, recognise town centres as the heart of their communities and pursue policies to support their viability and vitality; define a network and hierarchy of centres that is resilient to anticipated future economic changes; define the extent of town centres and primary shopping areas, based on a clear definition of primary and secondary frontages in designated centres, and set policies that make clear which uses will be permitted in such locations.</p> <p>As the supporting text to the policy recognises, urban areas and retail catchments do not follow local authority boundaries. Local authorities should co-operate to develop strategies to ensure that centres are protected and enhanced, and that new provision is appropriately located. The duty to cooperate should provide the basis for strategic planning in absence of the plan.</p> <p>Of all the policies in the NPPF dealing with sustainable transport, paragraph 37 is most relevant in the current context as it states that planning policies should aim for a balance of</p>			

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.</p> <p>Taken together it is expected that the significant benefits to the population and human health will remain in the absence of the South East Plan through regeneration and vibrant town centres, while less need to travel (particularly by car) should reduce congestion within town centres with benefits to air quality (and human health) and climate.</p> <p>The application of NPPF policies on conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paragraphs 126-141) will deliver similar cultural heritage benefits as with retention of the policy.</p> <p>It is expected that existing strategies introduced since adoption of the South East Plan will continue (possibly with some modifications) so the identified benefits would be apparent in the short, medium and long terms.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Core planning principles within the NPPF which include: transition to a low carbon future; promotion of mixed use developments and multiple benefits from land; conservation and enhancement of the natural environment and sustainable transport.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The South East Plan defines the areas which are being considered as Regional Hubs, Primary Regional Centres and Secondary Regional Centres, although the quantum of growth is not determined. The South East Plan considers that these have a strategic function and there is no guarantee that a similar approach will be taken by authorities in the region.</p>

RS Policy TC3: Out-of-Centre Regional/Sub-Regional Shopping Centres

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy does not identify the need for any further out-of-centre regional or sub-regional shopping centres or large scale extensions to existing centres during the period to 2026.</p> <p>There are no significant environmental impacts associated with this policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of this policy will ensure that LPAs will refer to their own Local Plan policies for decisions. There will also be need to ensure that those that are required to be updated, and are done so in accordance with the NPPF. The NPPF (section 2) emphasises the vitality of town centres and the need to positively promote competitive town centres. It also retains the requirement for application of a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre (paragraph 24). Out of town centre sites should only be considered if suitable locations are not present within the town or at its edge. Therefore, while the NPPF does not explicitly rule out more 'out of town' shopping development there is a</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>strong presumption against it. Whilst it therefore unlikely that there will be out of of town locations, there remains some residual uncertainty, as it will be dependent on specific local circumstance and local need. This uncertainty is reflected in the assessment of effects on biodiversity, population, soil, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape as these effects will be dependent on location and scale of any development.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The range of measures contained in the NPPF.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>No 'out of town' retail development is permitted.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As above.</p>

RS Policy TRS1: Coastal Resorts

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that opportunities will be sought to diversify the economic base of the region's coastal resorts, while considering and upgrading tourism facilities in ways which promote higher value activity, reduces seasonality and support urban regeneration.</p> <p>The South East comprises the largest tourism market in the UK, outside Greater London.</p> <p>The South East Regional Economic Strategy (RES) identifies that the Coastal South East is characterised by unique environmental assets and a string of distinctive coastal cities and towns, yet it is an area which has seen continued economic and social decline. The diversity of challenges faced in this area requires close collaboration between regional and local partners. Investment in the potential of individuals and areas to lift underperformance by harnessing a range of opportunities including skills progression, innovation and creativity, economic upgrading and culture and leisure-based growth will be required.</p> <p>The Coastal South East is characterised by some of the country's cleanest beaches, major environmental assets such as the Downs and the Channel Coast, and a number of coastal cities and towns each with their own distinctive character and history. Yet it is also an area of substantial untapped economic potential.</p> <p>The RES identifies that if the Coastal South East was to match the average economic performance of the UK, an estimated additional £13 billion in GVA would be added to the national economy each year.</p> <p>The 2010 Submission for a Local Enterprise Partnership for the Visitor Economy in Southern England identified that after London, the South East is the UK's most important tourism</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>economy generating over £13 billion per annum. 300,000 jobs are dependent on tourism – around 6% of the workforce. It is a golden thread that runs through urban, coastal and rural areas and one of the few sectors that has shown growth through the recession. Small increases in tourism translate into large increases in employment – every additional £50,000 spent by visitors creates one new job. Thus, it has the potential to lead economic recovery. The coastal strip and the Isle of Wight comprise a particularly diverse landscape, including the traditional coastal resorts, major urban centres for which tourism may or may not be a key economic driver, dramatic coastline, attractive hinterlands and high quality natural landscapes. It also accommodates a huge diversity of tourism-related activity from short activity breaks to traditional seaside holidays, business conferences and numerous day visits to visitor attractions.</p> <p>While the encouragement of visitor numbers to the coast through diversification has significant positive benefits for the economy, population and human health there is the potential that increased visitor numbers will have negative environmental effects, especially through increased transport (air quality and climatic factors) pollution and waste generation. Increased visitor numbers could also have adverse effects on biodiversity through increased recreational use and on demand for water.</p> <p>Revenue generated through tourism could assist with the upkeep of some heritage assets. Effects on landscape could be either positive (eg visitor management strategies) or negative (eg erosion of footpaths, litter etc.).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The policy states that environmentally sustainable development objectives should be set. This should minimise the risks of negative effects being significant.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>There is uncertainty around the effects for many environmental topics depending on the amount, nature, location and effects of development related to coastal resorts.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Government Tourism Policy March 2011 sets out the importance of this industry to the UK. This recognises the positive impact tourism can have on boosting regeneration.</p> <p>The NPPF in paragraph 23 sets out that LPAs should allocate a range of suitable sites to meet tourism needs in town centres.</p> <p>The relevant Local Economic Partnerships (LEPs) and Local Tourism Bodies (see Government Policy on Tourism March 2011 section 4.2) are taking forward setting the conditions for economic development and tourism marketing and management in areas that reflect Functional Economic Market Areas (FEMA) and an areas' visitor economy rather than public sector administrative boundaries-region.</p> <p>This along with the duty to co-operate, NPPF policies relating to planning strategically across local boundaries (paragraphs 156 and 178-181) will mean that local authorities should continue to ensure that land use and local transport policies are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their area.</p> <p>Revoking this policy will simplify the planning policy context and have no change to the effects anticipated from retention.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Cooperation will occur between all parties across local boundaries.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>LEPs and LTBs are non-statutory bodies and are not subject to the duty to cooperate. However, the bodies that are subject to the duty are required to have regard to the activities of LEPs. This is intended to strengthen strategic planning on economic activity, and tourism marketing and management.</p>

RS Policy TRS2: Rural Tourism

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that opportunities to promote tourism and recreation-based rural diversification should be encouraged where they provide jobs for local residents and are of a scale and type appropriate to their location. This policy looks to develop opportunities with all types of rural developments, protect and support upgrading inland waterways for recreational use and strengthening linkages between market towns and their hinterlands.</p> <p>Tourism, recreation and leisure activities in rural areas can bring significant economic, social and health benefits and can underpin the viability of local services providing a significant positive benefit to population and health.</p> <p>There are potential environmental impacts associated with tourism and recreation related development. The encouragement of tourists to visit areas, together with provision of infrastructure which can involve land take, may have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and landscape. Greater visitor numbers may generate higher traffic movement which could have an adverse impact on air quality and climate. However there is also the potential that increased tourism will bring additional funding and assist with environmental protection and retention or re-use of historic buildings contributing to the character of the countryside. This investment may offset any adverse impacts, and could result in benefit. Therefore the impacts on these aspects are assessed to be uncertain.</p> <p>There will be some associated use of water resources and material assets but this is likely to</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>be a local rather than regional impact and is assessed as neutral.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Uncertainties (as described above) in relation to whether positive or negative impacts will occur to biodiversity, soil, air, climate, cultural heritage and landscape.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Government Tourism Policy March 2011 sets out the importance of this industry to the UK. This recognises the positive impact tourism can have on boosting regeneration.</p> <p>The relevant Local Economic Partnerships (LEP) and Local Tourism Bodies (see Government Policy on Tourism March 2011 section 4.2) are taking forward setting the conditions for economic development and tourism marketing and management in areas that reflect Functional Economic Market Areas (FEMAs) and an areas' visitor economy rather than public sector administrative boundaries-region.</p> <p>This along with the duty to cooperate and NPPF policies relating to planning strategically across local boundaries (paragraphs 156 an 178-181) will mean that local authorities should continue to ensure that land use and local transport policies are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their area.</p> <p>The NPPF strongly supports sustainable economic growth across all sectors, which would include the tourism sector (paragraph 18-21). NPPF section 3 on supporting a prosperous rural economy, contains a specific policy (paragraph 28) which requires local and neighbourhood plans to support rural tourism which respects the character of the countryside.</p> <p>In addition, the NPPF also contains specific policies on tourism, linked to the vitality of town</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>centres (paragraph 23), and supporting a prosperous rural economy (paragraph 28).</p> <p>NPPF policies protecting the historic environment (paragraphs 126-141) provide strong protection for local features and assets.</p> <p>It is recognised that increasing visitor numbers can have negative (or positive) environment effects as identified for retention of the policy. Similar uncertainties apply to the impacts on biodiversity, soil, air, climate, cultural heritage and landscape. There is unlikely to be an impact on water or material assets.</p> <p>The effects of the revocation of the Plan are expected to be unchanged from retention.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Uncertainties (as described above) in relation to whether positive or negative impacts will occur to biodiversity, soil, air, climate, cultural heritage and landscape, dependent on the scope of development, and the potential for environmental enhancement facilitated by improved economic performance.</p>

RS Policy TRS3: Regionally Significant Sports Facilities

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that opportunities will be sought to protect, upgrade and develop new regionally significant sports facilities, particularly in the Thames Gateway, Milton Keynes/Aylesbury Vale and Ashford. Sport England seeks large scale investment on new and improved sports facilities. Sport England will play a vital role in advising individual local authorities on the need to provide facilities through the development plan process.</p> <p>The provision of sports facilities will provide a positive benefit to the population. The location of facilities is not prescribed, and some will be based on existing sites. Consequential environmental effects of development are uncertain, and will be related principally to the extent of land take (biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and landscape). While building materials will be required, this would present a local, rather than regional impact, and the impact is assessed as neutral. The impact on air and climate is assessed as uncertain (being likely to be neutral to minor negative), dependent on the traffic generated by the facilities, balanced against public transport. The impact on water resources and treatment is uncertain, dependent on the type of facility, for example swimming pools will have higher resource use, and requirement for waste water treatment.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA will be required for developments that have the potential for significant effects and mitigation measures will be developed through this process.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Environmental effects at different locations that may be proposed for development relating to land take, facility use, and transport infrastructure.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Sport England has long been engaged with policy development which promotes the interests of sport and recreation at regional, sub-regional and local levels. Sport England has 30 policy objectives for sport and recreation relating to: facility provision and protection, sport in the urban fringe, wider countryside and designated areas and the management of sports facilities. These are set out in appendices in the following documents: Proofing for Sport and Active Recreation in Spatial Plans and Development Control Guidance Note. Sport England's Planning Policy Objective 3 relates to preventing the loss or partial loss of any identified "Significant Area for Sport". Planning Policy Objective 4 relates to support to extend, upgrade or enhance any "Significant Area for Sport". In addition, Sport England provides checklists for the development of policy at the local level for development in site-specific locations. There are "Significant Areas for Sport" identified by Sport England in the South East for canoeing, parachuting, waterskiing and gliding, however none of these occur in the Milton Keynes, Aylesbury or Ashford area.</p> <p>Therefore removing this policy potentially will have both negative and positive effects by reducing the planning certainty that new regionally significant sport facilities can be upgraded and develop in the identified area.</p> <p>A review of the Local Plans which cover the Thames Gateway, Milton Keynes/Aylesbury Vale and Ashford identified that there is provision for regional sporting facilities to varying degrees.</p> <p>The emerging Milton Keynes Core Strategy contains an objective to develop Milton Keynes as an International Sporting City and develop regional sports facilities although the Strategy does not contain any policies to give effect to this objective.</p> <p>Ashford's Core Strategy (adopted 2008) sets out a policy which seeks to provide for infrastructure and facilities for sport and recreation in general (Policy CS18) but does not</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>contain policies relevant to regionally significant sports facilities.</p> <p>Dartford Borough Council have identified in their Core Strategy (adopted September 2011) land at Stone Lodge where sport and recreational uses requiring more extensive use of land would be appropriate (Policy CS22). The policy continues on to note that the Council, working in partnership, will encourage the development of centres of excellence for sport and recreational facilities at this location.</p> <p>This will potentially result in uncertain but potentially significant positive and negative effects from the above. In addition the NPPF does not seek to protect or safeguard these facilities from alternative uses. Therefore this potential planning restrictions in the Development Plan does create the potential for significant negative and positive effects by enabling the reuse of such sites for alternative uses such as land for housing.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>EIA will be required for developments that have the potential for significant effects and mitigation measures will be developed through this process.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Environmental effects at different locations that may be proposed for development relating to land take, facility use, and transport infrastructure.</p>

RS Policy TRS4: Tourism Attractions

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy looks at both improving the quality of existing facilities and development of new regionally significant tourism attractions where they will expand the overall tourism market and can be easily accessed by public transport.</p> <p>The effects of this policy are uncertain based on what the potential developments might entail and where they might be located.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA will be required where there are potentially significant effects on the environment and mitigation measures will be proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Scale, type and location of potential tourist attractions.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>New regionally important tourism developments require significant upfront investment due to their scale and consequential complexity with a range of interests and infrastructure providers. The Government Tourism Policy March 2011 at paragraph 3.4.2 notes that for the tourism industry the planning system is hard to predict making it harder for tourism providers and attractions to expand and adding extra costs.</p> <p>Therefore revoking this South East Plan policy reduces the positive planning position of the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Development for such facilities in the identified broad locations. This potentially will lead to delays in delivering development in these broad locations or not delivering at all over the Plan period.</p> <p>Alternatively, for investors seeking to locate this scale of facility outside the locations identified in the South East Plan policy it removes the Development Plan's sequential approach to having to establish that that no suitable sites in the South East Plan chosen locations are available.</p> <p>Revoking of the South East Plan policy could save time, reduce costs for those investors as the removal of South East Plan housing provision requirements will leave the NPPF's policy along with the Government tourism policy which sets out in paragraph 6.5.</p> <p>DCMS and Visit England will work with the Department for Communities and Local Government to help Local Authorities develop local plans which allow tourism businesses to expand and flourish.</p> <p>Overall, revoking this policy will have uncertain and potentially positive and/or negative effects depending on whether the policy is seen by the tourism industry as a help or impediment to bring forward their tourism developments.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>EIA will be required where there are potentially significant effects on the environment and mitigation measures will be proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Potential positive and negative effects depending on whether the policy is seen by the tourism industry as a help or impediment to bring forward their tourism developments.</p> <p>Location, scale and type of development.</p>

RS Policy TRS5: Tourist Accommodation

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that the diversity of the accommodation sector will be positively reflected in tourism and planning policies.</p> <p>This policy looks at the requirement for tourist accommodation both in existing facilities that may require upgrading and extension, or for the development of new facilities.</p> <p>The visitor accommodation sector has become increasingly demanding and sophisticated and there is a requirement for a range of accommodation to suit all types of visitors. There is also an ongoing need to increase accommodation provision for staff in association with hotels and un-serviced accommodation in the region. Significant expansion of existing sites may be required to facilitate the provisions of new facilities, and upgrading of facilities, particularly in coastal regions.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>There may be both positive and negative effects depending on the scale and location of new and expanded facilities.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Government Tourism Policy March 2011 sets out the importance of this industry to the UK. This recognises the positive impact tourism can have on boosting regeneration.</p> <p>The NPPF in paragraph 23 sets out that LPAs should allocate a range of suitable sites to meet tourism needs in town centres.</p> <p>The relevant Local Economic Partnerships (LEP) and Local Tourism Bodies (see Government Policy on Tourism March 2011 section 4.2) are taking forward setting the conditions for economic development and tourism marketing and management in areas that reflect Functional Economic Market Areas FEMAs and an areas' visitor economy rather than public sector administrative boundaries-region.</p> <p>This along with the duty to co-operate, NPPF policies relating to planning strategically across local boundaries (paragraphs 156 an 178-181) will mean that local authorities should continue to ensure that land use and local transport policies are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their area.</p> <p>NPPF section 3 on supporting a prosperous rural economy, with specific policy for local and neighbourhood plans to support rural tourism which respects the character of the countryside.</p> <p>The NPPF strongly supports sustainable economic growth across all sectors, which would include the Tourism sector (paragraph 18-21) and it also contains specific policies on tourism, linked to the vitality of town centres (paragraph 23), and supporting a prosperous rural economy (paragraph 28).</p> <p>NPPF policies protecting the historic environment (paragraphs 126-141) provide strong protection for local features and assets.</p> <p>It is recognised that increasing visitor numbers can have negative environment effects as identified in the original sustainability appraisal. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF states that local and neighbourhood plans should support sustainable rural tourism developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>There may be both positive and negative effects depending on the scale and location of new and expanded facilities.</p>

RS Policy TRS6: Visitor Management

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy recognises that local development frameworks (LDFs) and tourism or cultural strategies will identify areas which would benefit from the development and implementation of visitor management. Where different local authority areas form part of a single destination or market, opportunities should be taken to coordinate or integrate the development and implementation of visitor management plans.</p> <p>This policy recognises that the potential environmental pressures associated with high levels of visitor activity are intensified as a result of poor visitor management. As a result of the policy there should be positive benefits for a range of environmental factors, however the exact nature of the benefits is uncertain and may vary for the environment associated with each management plan.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Nature of each environment where visitor plans are being developed and the nature of the proposed management strategies in the different plans which, while having the aim to have overall benefits may have negative effects on a particular environmental factor for a greater benefit to another.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The relevant Local Economic Partnerships (LEPs) and Local Tourism Bodies (LTBs) (see Government Policy on Tourism March 2011 section 4.2) are taking forward setting the conditions for economic development and tourism marketing and management in areas that reflect Functional Economic Market Areas FEMAs and an areas' visitor economy rather than public sector administrative boundaries-region.</p> <p>This along with the duty to co-operate, NPPF policies relating to planning strategically across local boundaries (paragraphs 156 an 178-181) will mean that local authorities should continue to ensure that land use and local transport policies are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their area.</p> <p>LEPs and LTBs are non-statutory bodies and are not subject to the duty. However, the bodies that are subject to the duty are required to have regard to the activities of LEPs. This is intended to strengthen strategic planning on economic activity and tourism marketing and management.</p> <p>Therefore revoking this policy will have the same range of effects and uncertainties as associated with retention.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Nature of each environment where visitor plans are being developed and the nature of the proposed management strategies in the different plans which, while having the aim to have overall benefits may have negative effects on a particular environmental factor for a greater benefit to another.</p>

RS Policy TRS7: Priority Areas for Tourism

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies that local development frameworks, tourism/cultural strategies and transport plans will seek to emphasise and implement sub-regional priorities in identified tourism areas.</p> <p>The policy identifies a number of priorities that should be implemented in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Coastal Strip and the Isle of Wight • Windsor and surrounds • Oxford • River Thames • Thames Gateway • Milton Keynes/Aylesbury Vale and Ashford. <p>The policy also identifies that there should be an interregional approach to coordination and management in the following tourism areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Thames Gateway • Oxford • New Forest • Windsor and surrounds

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chilterns ANOB Milton Keynes/Aylesbury Vale. <p>The priorities include things such as: upgrading facilities, improving access, reducing seasonality, having regard to capacity and environmental sensitivity, improved visitor management, encouraging longer stays, growth in business, sporting, environmental and attraction based tourism.</p> <p>The policy will provide positive benefit to the economy and therefore the population. However there is a wide and varied range of environments that encompass the priority areas and a large number of different priorities that may produce either positive or negative effects that cannot be clearly identified.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Wide and varied range of environments that encompass the priority areas and a large number of different priorities that may produce either positive or negative effects that cannot be clearly identified.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The relevant Local Economic Partnerships (LEP) and Local Tourism Bodies (LTBs) (see Government Policy on Tourism March 2011 section 4.2) are taking forward setting the conditions for economic development and tourism marketing and management in areas that reflect Functional Economic Market Areas FEMAs and an areas' visitor economy rather than public sector administrative boundaries-region.</p> <p>This along with the duty to co-operate, NPPF policies relating to planning strategically across local boundaries (paragraphs 156 an 178-181) will mean that local authorities should continue</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>to ensure that land use and local transport policies are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their area.</p> <p>Although it is acknowledged that LEPs and LTBs are non-statutory bodies and are not subject to the duty. However, the bodies that are subject to the duty are required to have regard to the activities of LEPs. This is intended to strengthen strategic planning on economic activity and tourism marketing and management.</p> <p>The policy sets out a spatial prioritisation and approach to particular parts of the region to focus on in terms of raising the tourism potential of different tourist sectors in different places.</p> <p>The RSS policy's approach and supporting evidence will be available for Local Tourism Bodies, LPAs and LEPs to take forward, as described elsewhere in this section.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the revocation of this policy will reduce the certainty for investors and potentially the focus on these sectors and management in the localities.</p> <p>Overall the effects of revocation remain the same as retaining the policy. The identification of positive effects is possible for the economy and therefore the population. However there is a wide and varied range of environments where tourism may develop. It is uncertain that development will continue to occur in the priority areas identified in the revoked policy. Also it is uncertain if the number of different priorities may continue to be considered. Development may produce either positive or negative effects that cannot be clearly identified.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Wide and varied range of environments that encompass the priority areas and a large number of different priorities that may produce either positive or negative effects that cannot be clearly identified.</p>

RS Policy S1: Supporting Healthy Communities

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy sets out the requirement for local plans to embrace preventative measures aimed at addressing the causes of ill health. Examples would include: providing community access to parks, open space and cultural facilities; encouraging healthier forms of transport (e.g. by provision of cycle lanes) and facilitating access to housing for socially excluded groups. Local authorities are encouraged to work with other service providers including Primary Care Trusts, education authorities etc, to develop policies which encourage healthy lifestyles.</p> <p>Measures which encourage greater recreation, better nutrition, and provide housing to socially disadvantaged sections of the community will have a positive impact on human health.</p> <p>There may be a small requirement to provide infrastructure, e.g. for cycle lanes, and access routes to parks but this is likely to have a negligible impact on material assets, biodiversity and soils. Impacts on water, air, climate, cultural heritage and landscape are considered to be neutral.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>No major infrastructure associated with the measures taken.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>This is a generic policy and therefore no detail regarding the measures to be taken.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>A core planning principle within the NPPF is that planning should 'take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs'. This is supported by section 8 (Promoting healthy communities) and section 4 (Promoting sustainable transport).</p> <p>The NPPF also requires that local planning authorities should work with public health leads and health organisations to understand and take account of the health status and needs of the local population including for sports and recreation (para. 171).</p> <p>Adoption of the framework within the NPPF, in combination with other Government guidance and strategy relating to healthy communities, would have the same positive impact on human health as would be achieved by the South East Plan policy. However there may be some delay in the short term as local authorities develop their Local Plans.</p> <p>Mitigation N/A</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty None identified</p>

RS Policy S2: Promoting Sustainable Health Services

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires local authorities to work with the NHS in order to provide additional health and social care facilities to meet primary care needs. Where needed, land is to be made available for additional, community, social and primary care facilities. The joint working also relates to facilitating joint planning, and influencing NHS estate strategies with Health Impact Assessments becoming integral to decision making.</p> <p>The provision of additional primary health care and associated facilities will have a significant positive impact on human health. Any measures taken to reduce the high sickness absenteeism in the region will have a significant positive impact on the economic performance of small and medium sized companies which are most susceptible to the effects of absenteeism.</p> <p>If additional land take is required for the construction of facilities, there would be a small scale and localised adverse impact on biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and landscape. The use of construction materials will have a small scale adverse impact on material assets. These are considered to be local rather than regional impacts and are scored as neutral.</p> <p>Within the supporting text the policy identifies the need for the NHS to work more closely with planning authorities including improvement in sustainability, for example with respect to carbon emissions. A reduction in carbon emissions would have a positive impact on climate.</p> <p>Additional facilities would have some requirement for water, and may generate additional traffic, but the overall effect on water resources and air quality would be negligible.</p> <p>Any impact on cultural heritage is uncertain and would depend on the location of new</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>development in relation to areas of archaeological and/or historic importance.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions There is some land take for new facilities.</p> <p>Uncertainty The extent and location of land take.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The requirement for future NHS facilities will be determined by GP consortia as successor organisations to Primary Care Trusts.</p> <p>The NPPF requires local authorities to set strategic priorities for the area in respect of providing health facilities (para. 156), and to work with other authorities and providers on infrastructure planning for health and social care (para. 162). In addition local authorities have a duty to co-operate with other bodies on strategic issues which cross administrative boundaries.</p> <p>In view of the above it is reasonable to assume that local planning authorities will continue to work with relevant health providers to provide sufficient land to meet the needs of the health services. The NPPF also supports the move to a low carbon future, with new development planned in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions (para. 95).</p> <p>The impacts of revocation will be the same as for retention of the policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p>	

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<u>Assumptions</u> None <u>Uncertainty</u> None

RS Policy S3: Education and Skills

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>There are parts of the region (e.g. the Thames Gateway and the Kent coast) where the skill base is relatively low and this is seen as an impediment to employment and economic growth.</p> <p>The theme of skills improvement is also a core component of the objective for 'Smart Growth' within the Regional Economic Strategy (RES). Under the umbrella of 'Smart Growth' the RES seeks to 'maximise the number of people ready for employment at all skill levels, and ensure they are equipped to progress in the labour market' (section 6), and at 6.1 'ensure education and training providers deliver skills provision and services to meet business requirements and stimulate the demand for higher level skills, including the use of Sector Skills Agreements'.</p> <p>This policy requires local authorities to work with partners to ensure adequate provision of pre-school, school and community learning facilities. Policies should seek to improve accessibility including the assessment of need; encouragement of mixed use approaches, and good public transport access.</p> <p>Achievement of the 'step change' envisaged by this policy would improve the skills level of individuals, particularly in deprived areas, and have a significant positive impact on employment and the local economy.</p> <p>The requirement to incorporate new facilities within new development is likely to involve some land take which will have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and landscape. The construction of buildings with have an adverse impact on material assets and water use will have an adverse impact on water resources. On a regional scale these impacts would be neutral, although this may not be the case in the local setting.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>The supporting text to the policy encourages the use of public transport and therefore any increase in the use of cars is likely to be minimal and consequently the impact on air quality and climate would be neutral.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Policy will involve land take for development.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Extent and location of land take.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Education Authorities have the responsibility to meet educational needs of local communities although there is an increasing number of Academies and Free Schools which may encourage more development at a local level to meet specific needs of the community.</p> <p>A core principle of the NPPF is for planning to drive and support healthy communities and also for promoting mixed use developments (para.17).</p> <p>The NPPF also requires local authorities to take a <i>'proactive, positive and collaborative approach'</i> to ensuring that there is a sufficient choice of school places to meet current and future demand. They are also required to give great weight to the need to <i>'create, expand or alter schools'</i>. The South East LEP covers some of the more under skilled parts of the region (Thames Gateway and Thanet Coast) and one of its four main enabling activities is related to improving skills. Local authorities are under a duty to co-operate with other bodies including the LEP and it is anticipated that revocation of the policy will have a similar outcome to retention with respect to impacts on the economic development and the population. A similar level of additional development would also be reasonable, with similar potential adverse environmental effects on a local, rather than regional, scale.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions Policy will involve land take for development.</p> <p>Uncertainty Extent and location of land take.</p>

RS Policy S4: Higher and Further Education

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Higher and further education providers are economically important; provide important support to the development of high skill base industries, and also have facilities which are a resource for the wider community. This policy requires local authorities to work with Learning and Skills Council, the Higher Education Funding Council, SEEDA and the higher/further education sector to ensure that their needs are reflected in development frameworks.</p> <p>This is a high level policy which establishes the importance of the higher/further education sector to the region and the local economy. Support to their expansion provides benefit to the local economy and, through development of high skills which are matched to industrial/commercial requirements of the region can provide significant economic benefit on a regional scale.</p> <p>The supporting text to the policy recognises the importance of ancillary services for higher education establishments including student accommodation, sports facilities, incubator units, and the need to encourage developments which maximise the potential of a university by siting it as part of a multi-use development. While some of the ancillary development may be on previously used land it is likely to incur further land take which could have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and landscape. The use of construction materials is likely to have an adverse impact on material assets.</p> <p>Physical expansion is likely to result in a higher number of car journeys and this would have a negative impact on air quality and climate. Further development would also have an adverse impact on water resources.</p> <p>The extent of the adverse impacts predicted on biodiversity, soil, water, air, climate, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape on a regional scale is difficult to predict as the major potential impact would be associated with ancillary development occurring later in the plan</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>period. In the medium to long term these impacts are likely to range between neutral and minor adverse.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions Policy will involve land take.</p> <p>Uncertainty Extent and timing of ancillary development, land take, and associated transport and water usage.</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Universities and other providers of higher/further education will have a significant role to play in determining the extent of ancillary development which is appropriate. The visions set out by each organisation generally include an objective to develop strategic partnerships with business and the community.</p> <p>Local authorities are required to co-operate with other bodies on strategic issues and therefore it is anticipated that the co-operation envisaged by the policy with the further/higher education sector would continue following revocation.</p> <p>A component of the South East LEP's enabling activity relating to skills involves a role with businesses, colleges and universities to improve the skills of the existing workforce and those of young people entering the workforce.</p> <p>The level of physical expansion associated with the development of the further/higher education sector and provision of infrastructure would be similar to that if the policy was in place.</p> <p>Consequently the impacts associated with revocation of the policy are the same as those for</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow			Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			<p>retention.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions Policy will involve land take.</p> <p>Uncertainty Extent and timing of ancillary development, land take, and associated transport and water usage.</p>

RS Policy S5: Cultural and Sporting Activity

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy aims to extend access to, and sustainable participation in, sport, recreation and cultural activity.</p> <p>Cultural and creative activities account for 13% of the region's employment, and consequently expansion of this sector would have a positive impact on jobs and the local economy. Greater participation in sporting activities and recreation (including by disadvantaged parts of the community) would have a beneficial impact on human health.</p> <p>The policy encourages the location of facilities in areas where they can be accessed by sustainable transport, e.g. walking and cycling. , This would reduce the potential for increased aerial emissions from private transport, which would otherwise be predicted as a consequence of extended access to sport and culture. The impact on air quality and climate is considered to be neutral.</p> <p>The level, if any, of additional infrastructure required to support the policy is uncertain and the impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, material assets and cultural heritage are unclear.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty Extent of related development.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	0	0	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Section 8 of the NPPF provides the framework for 'Promoting Healthy Communities'. The NPPF states (paragraph 69) that the planning system 'can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities'. A key tenet of the NPPF is community involvement in the development of Local Plans, and the facilitation of neighbourhood plans. Paragraph 70 states that planning policies and decisions should 'plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilitiesand other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments'. Paragraph 73 requires plans to be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sports and recreation facilities and paragraph 74 provides protection from development on existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land.</p> <p>Other sections of the NPPF are also relevant to this policy including section 12 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) which requires local authorities to take into account 'the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring'. Section 4 of the NPPF promotes 'sustainable transport'.</p> <p>Revocation of the policy would mean that the objectives are not explicitly stated, although the combined sections of the NPPF cover similar areas. There is likely to be some variation between authorities in interpretation although the overall objectives are likely to be met in the longer term. This would result in some delay to the positive impacts associated with the policy. The extent of any negative impacts remains uncertain.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumption</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p><u>Uncertainty</u> Extent of related development.</p>

RS Policy S6: Community Infrastructure

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	-	-	?	?	?	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy addresses the community infrastructure requirements which are anticipated to rise in line with population growth. Regional planning authorities should work with Government and other agencies to increase investment in physical and social infrastructure including community centres, fire and rescue stations, leisure centres, waste and recycling facilities etc. The policy encourages mixed use solutions for community facilities and promotes accessibility. Community infrastructure should support economic growth, with particular emphasis on health and education.</p> <p>Planning to ensure appropriate and timely provision of infrastructure to support economic growth will have a positive impact on the population.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the infrastructure will comprise a combination of re-use of some existing building, and new construction. The provision of new infrastructure will use construction materials and will have an adverse impact on material assets. The land take will have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape. The policy encourages effective use of resources, and measures to reduce transport therefore the residual impact on air quality and climate is uncertain. Any impact on cultural heritage would depend on the location and extent of infrastructure related to the presence of sites of archaeological and/or historic importance. Additional infrastructure would use water, but the regional impact on water resources is considered to be minimal.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policy requirements to encourage mixed use of facilities, effective use of resources, and reductions in travel. Other policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>(CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions Mixed use community facilities are feasible.</p> <p>Uncertainty As above. Net impact on air quality and climate.</p>
Revocation	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	-	-	?	?	?	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>A core principle of the NPPF is to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development in order to deliver <i>inter alia</i> the homes and infrastructure that the country needs.</p> <p>Paragraph 69 of the NPPF requires planning authorities to 'create a shared vision with communities of the residential environmental and the facilities they wish to see'. Planning authorities are required to involve all sections of the community in development of Local Plans and should facilitate neighbourhood planning. There is a requirement (paragraph 70) to plan positively for provision and use of shared space (including local shops, sports venues etc), and to ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.</p> <p>These requirements, together with others in the NPPF relating to sustainable transport and good design, in combination with the duty to co-operate with other bodies on strategic issues (e.g. health paragraph 156), provides a similar framework to that embodied in the South East Plan policy. The impacts associated with revocation are therefore the same as those for retention of the policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Requirements of the NPPF are addressed in a similar timescale to the South East Plan.</p>			

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Light Green	Light Green	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow							Yellow	Orange	Orange				Yellow	Orange	Orange	<p><u>Uncertainty</u> As above.</p>

RS Policy SH1: CORE POLICY

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy sets out that development in South Hampshire will be led by sustainable economic growth and urban regeneration. Portsmouth and Southampton will be dual focuses for investment and development as employment, retail, entertainment, higher education and cultural centres for the sub-region. The other towns will play a complementary role serving their more local areas.</p> <p>The aim for this sub-region is to improve economic performance up to 2026, which will allow for the provision of 80,000 net additional dwellings in this same time frame, whilst at the same time seeking to address areas of social deprivation and protect and enhance environmental quality.</p> <p>Beyond development on existing allocated sites, the policy provides for greenfield development concentrated in two 'strategic development areas' (SDAs). The urban extensions and SDAs will be located close to and with good transport links to Southampton and Portsmouth and other major employment centres. Their location will also help support improvements in public transport infrastructure and services across a wider area.</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment opportunities and housing; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on large urban extensions on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource, increased commuting along the principal road networks (M27, M3) leading to increased emissions).</p>		

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
		0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?		?	0	?
Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for more houses within the sub-region. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing, for example through initiatives such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, New Homes Bonus and the local retention of business rates are intended to encourage a more positive attitude to growth and allow communities to share the benefits and mitigate the negative effects of growth. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities in order to ...'boost significantly the supply of housing..'</p> <p>The sub-regional area covered by the South Hampshire policy includes a partnership of the unitary authorities of Portsmouth and Southampton; Hampshire County Council and district authorities of Eastleigh, East Hampshire, Fareham, Gosport, Havant, Test Valley and Winchester. The partnership (PUSH) has evolved to deliver a shared vision of a more prosperous and sustainable South Hampshire.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>The PUSH aims to deliver a shared vision of a more prosperous and sustainable South Hampshire which includes the aim to provide 80,000 homes in the sub-region by 2026 (Homes for Growth Sub Regional Housing Strategy - Summary 2007 – 2011). PUSH has completed a housing market assessment (2006) and subsequently completed annual monitoring reports, the most recent of which noted that there had been a net increase in of 2,441 dwellings from 2010. This compares to the average annual dwelling increase that the 80,000 dwelling target implies of 4,000.</p> <p>It is the extent to which these housing figures are reflected in the adopted Local Plans that will influence that pace of housing provision in the sub-region. For example Fareham BC reduced the dwellings requirement from the 10,000 to between 6,500 to 7,500 for the SDA and Eastleigh BC has resolved that the North / North East Hedge End SDA should not be taken forward in its Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Solent Local Economic Partnership (LEP) is taking forward setting the conditions for economic development in the sub-region. The LEP now includes the Isle of Wight. The LEP focus for growth remains in the Portsmouth and Southampton area.</p> <p>Given the presence of PUSH and the Solent LEP, over the long term, the scale of development in the sub-region is considered unlikely to change substantially in the absence of the regional strategy. However, current Local Plans are at variance with the overall commitment, albeit that some are yet to be adopted. In the short term this may introduce some delays into the process. Where it does occur, this would provide the same significant benefits for the population.</p> <p>Depending on the location of the development, given the change in policy in the NPPF on the priority to be given to the use of previously developed land, there could be less concentrated forms of development in urban centres and, where available, more greenfield development. The extent to which this would affect biodiversity, landscape and soil will depend on the eventual location, scale and nature of development.</p> <p>Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of housing delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	Orange	<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the South East Plan.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the South East Plan, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy SH2: STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT AREAS

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy sets out for the main centres of South Hampshire, the requirement that they, through the DPD process make provision for growth and development. This includes reference to high quality mixed-use development; improvements to the public realm and conservation initiatives within town centres; and improved access from central areas to parks, open spaces and waterfront destinations for business and leisure. The policy also anticipates the need after 2016 that two new centres will be required within the proposed SDAs.</p> <p>The policy makes provision for a range of housing typologies and for co-ordinated and integrated employment, transport and housing development, together with supporting health, community, social, shopping, education, recreation and leisure facilities, green space and other identified requirements. Particular attention will be paid to securing quality public transport links with neighbouring city and town centres, transport hubs and existing or planned major employment locations.</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment opportunities and housing; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on large urban extensions on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource, increased commuting along the principal road networks (M27, M3) leading to increased emission.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the South East Plan (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>environment. In addition, there are statutory duties on organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies (in this case Southern Water) to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for more houses within the sub-region. However, current planning policy in the relevant local authorities suggests that there are still some uncertainties as to the extent of the remaining local plans to deliver the aspirations of the policy.</p> <p>The Fareham Borough Core Strategy (adopted August 2011) has reduced the dwellings requirement from the 10,000 to between 6,500 and 7,500. Eastleigh Borough Council has resolved that the feasibility studies should be noted but that the North / North East Hedge End SDA should not be taken forward in its Core Strategy and that it should consider new options for future development.</p> <p>This decision means that currently less progress is being made on the implementation of either SDA so it is likely that there will at least be a delay in the provision of new dwellings equivalent to that envisaged in the SDA. However, both LPAs could take an alternative approach to meeting the objective assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area relying less on large strategic sites and optimising use of infill sites. The extent to which this would affect biodiversity, landscape and soil will depend on the eventual</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary	
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L		
	Yellow	White	White	Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Light Orange	Light Orange	Light Orange	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White		<p>location, scale and nature of development.</p> <p>Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of housing delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the policy.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the South East Plan, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Plan is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy SH3: SCALE, LOCATION AND TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy requires that employment land be provided to accommodate two million square metres of new business floorspace covering B1 Offices, B2 Manufacturing and B8 Warehousing. This is to be located on the following in Eastleigh:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. previously developed land within the cities and towns - 677,000 m² ii. greenfield land in the North/North East of Hedge End Strategic Development Area - 74,000 m² iii. greenfield land in the larger urban extensions and other greenfield sites with high accessibility allocated for that purpose in development plan documents (DPDs) - 316,000m². <p>And to be located on the following sites in Fareham:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. previously developed land within the cities and towns - 480,000 m² ii. greenfield land in the Fareham Strategic Development Area - 121,000 m² iii. greenfield land in the larger urban extensions and other greenfield sites with high accessibility allocated for that purpose in DPDs - 297,000m². <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource). Whilst development in both LPAs emphasises the need for sustainable transport, it is still likely given the good road transport connections that the employment sites will increase local commuting on the principal</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary				
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L					
																															<p>road networks (M27, M3) in the sub-region.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the South East Plan (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment. In addition, there are statutory duties on organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies (in this case Southern Water) to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>	
Revocation	0	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for employment opportunities within the sub-region. The 2011 Housing Market Report to PUSH noted that whilst the unemployment rate had fallen marginally the proportion of the population actively engaged in the labour market has reduced slightly.</p> <p>However, as with the housing allocations in the SDA, current planning policy in the relevant local authorities suggests that there are still some uncertainties as to the extent of the remaining local plans to deliver the aspirations of the policy.</p> <p>The Fareham Borough Core Strategy has decreased the employment land provision in the SDA down to 90,750 m² from 121,000m². In July 2010, Eastleigh BC formally resolved that the SDA would not be taken forward in the Council's planning work. It is stated on their website that 'This followed the Coalition Government's stated intention to revoke the South</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>East Plan and all other regional spatial strategies.'</p> <p>There are other strategic employment sites being developed in the sub-region. The Government announced a Solent Enterprise Zone in this area at the former HMS Daedalus site (a former airfield). This is being taken forward by the LEP. Outline planning application has been approved by both Fareham BC and Gosport BC to develop 110,000 sqm of employment space creating up to 3,500 jobs.</p> <p>However, collectively the evidence suggests that there is currently less progress being made on the implementation of either SDA so it is possible that there will be a delay in the provision of new employment sites equivalent to that envisaged in the SDA. Resulting positive effects will be deferred and reduced at this stage.</p> <p>Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of employment land delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the South East Plan.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the South East Plan, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Plan is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery is likely to be lower than provided for by the Plan and therefore the scale of the effects are likely to be less.</p>

RS Policy SH4: STRATEGY FOR MAIN TOWN CENTRES

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy sets out for the main centres of South Hampshire, the requirement that they, through the DPD process make provision for growth and development. This includes reference to high quality mixed-use development; improvements to the public realm and conservation initiatives within town centres; and improved access from central areas to parks, open spaces and waterfront destinations for business and leisure. The policy also anticipates the need after 2016 that two new centres will be required within the proposed SDAs.</p> <p>Large office, retail and leisure developments are well suited to city and town centres and other locations which have good public transport accessibility. Their presence within the heart of the urban area can also help create vitality and underpin regeneration. With significant pressure to develop these facilities outside existing centres, Policy SH4 seeks to ensure that all development plan documents treat them in the same way.</p> <p>The key environmental effects of the policy are linked to reduced travel (particularly through opportunities for more public transport) and the benefit this may have for air quality and climatic factors in the medium to long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Traffic management measures and policies to encourage non-car modes of transport set out elsewhere in the South East Plan would reduce the negative effects of air pollution in town centres.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty The actual effects on biodiversity, soil, water, air quality, climate change and material assets will depend on the degree to which the policy effectively balances the demands for out of centre sites (potentially on greenfield locations) and inner city development and intensification (most likely to involve the reuse of previously developed land). The Plan notes that much of the current development pipeline for business growth is out of town, the main centres have capacity and potential to accommodate most of the forecast growth requirements over the Plan period. As such the effects over the medium and long term are recorded as uncertain.</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	0	?	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation Paragraph 23 of the NPPF seeks to promote competitive town centres and leaves it to local planning authorities to define the extent of town centres and primary shopping areas and set policies that make clear which uses will be permitted in such locations. Paragraphs 29-41 deal with sustainable transport and seek to reduce the need to travel and make greater use of public transport. The effects on air quality and climate would remain uncertain in the medium to long term given the link between congestion and air pollution.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures As with retention of the policy, traffic management measures can assist in reducing congestion and the resulting air pollution.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty The actual effects on biodiversity, soil, water, air quality, climate change and material assets will depend on the degree to which Local Plan policies reflect the NPPF and provide balance between the demands for out of centre sites (potentially on greenfield locations) and inner city</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary	
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L		
	Yellow			Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow		Orange	Yellow			Yellow				development. Whilst current development sites for business growth is predominately out of town, the main centres have capacity and potential to accommodate growth. As such the effects over the medium and long term are recorded as uncertain.

RS Policy SH5: SCALE AND LOCATION OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT 2006-2026

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>The policy requires the South Hampshire LPAs to allocate sufficient land and facilitate the delivery of 80,000 net additional dwellings in South Hampshire between 2006 and 2026. This is split between the named authorities (East Hampshire, Eastleigh, Fareham, Gosport, Havant, New Forest, Portsmouth, Southampton, Test Valley and Winchester). The SDAs identified in policy SH1 are also included.</p> <p>The increased provision of housing is likely to lead to significantly positive effects on the population and human health in the medium to long term. However, this will also depend on related factors such as the quality of the houses, their density, location relative to green spaces and ambient air quality.</p> <p>The demand for construction materials energy is likely to increase, as is traffic in the region, while the amount of waste generated is also likely to increase. These are likely to have negative impacts on material assets, air quality and climatic factors.</p> <p>Increasing the number of residents in the area is likely to increase demand for water resources and have an effect on soil through greenfield land take (particularly in the SDAs identified).</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Many of the policies in the South East Plan (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the South East Plan and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for more houses within the sub-region. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing, Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities to achieve this objective. Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it could have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur, subject to the status of local plans.</p> <p>PUSH aims to deliver a shared vision of a more prosperous and sustainable South Hampshire which includes the aim to provide 80,000 homes in the sub-region by 2026 (Homes for Growth Sub Regional Housing Strategy - Summary 2007 – 2011). PUSH has completed a housing market assessment (2006) and subsequently completed annual monitoring reports, the most recent of which noted that there had been a net increase of 2,441 dwellings from 2010. This compares to the average annual dwelling increase that the 80,000 dwelling target implies of 4,000.</p> <p>It is the extent to which these housing figures are reflected in the adopted Local Plans that will influence that pace of housing provision in the sub-region. For example Fareham BC reduced the dwellings requirement from the 10,000 to between 6,500 and 7,500 for the SDA and Eastleigh BC has resolved that the North / North East Hedge End SDA should not be taken forward in its Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Solent Local Economic Partnership (LEP) is taking forward setting the conditions for</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Yellow			Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Light Orange			Light Orange			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			<p>economic development in the sub-region. The LEP now includes the Isle of Wight. The LEP focus for growth remains in the Portsmouth and Southampton area.</p> <p>Given the presence of PUSH and the Solent LEP, over the long term, the scale of development in the sub-region is considered unlikely to change substantially in the absence of the regional strategy. However, current Local Plans are at variance with the overall commitment, albeit that some are yet to be adopted. In the short and medium term this may introduce some delays into the process. Where it does occur, this would provide the same significant benefits for the population.</p> <p>Depending on the location of the development, given the change in policy in the NPPF on the priority to be given to the use of previously developed land, there could be less concentrated forms of development in urban centres and, where available, more greenfield development. The extent to which this would affect biodiversity, landscape and soil will depend on the eventual location, scale and nature of development.</p> <p>Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of housing delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution (required under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010), should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the South East Plan.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the South East Plan, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Plan is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary	
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L		
	Yellow	White	White	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	White	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White		for by the Plan and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.

RS Policy SH6: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy sets out the range (30-40%) of housing on new development sites should be affordable housing. It requires that LPAs in South Hampshire develop a common policy framework (covering house types, sizes, tenure and applicability). It requires that local development documents will set the percentage of housing on development sites which must be affordable in order to contribute towards the sub-regional target.</p> <p>Increased provision of affordable housing will have significant benefits to the population and human health. The policy and hence its benefits will be very much dependent upon the market being able/willing to deliver the level of affordable housing proposed.</p> <p>There may be short term benefits to the soil topic through the use of vacant buildings and brownfield land; however, in order to meet the targets and receive a long term gain, it is inevitable that there will be development on greenfield land. The quality of the housing delivered will determine whether the development creates an attractive environment.</p> <p>The policy could potentially help reduce the need to travel if the delivery of affordable housing meant that people in need of such housing lived close to where they work. The opposite effects would occur if the location of affordable houses led to greater travel distances.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the South East Plan (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the South East Plan and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for more affordable houses within the sub-region and the revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it will have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur.</p> <p>Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing and states that local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their local plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for affordable housing. This is expected to have the same significant benefits to the population and human health as retention of the policy, although as with revocation of policy H1 there could be fewer benefits to the population in the short term in those local authorities without an up to date plan.</p> <p>PUSH's Homes for Growth Sub Regional Housing Strategy - Summary 2007 – 2011 noted that between 1999 and 2006, house prices in South Hampshire have more than doubled whilst earnings have increased at a slower rate, resulting in a 60% decline in affordability. In advance of, and consistent with, the South East Plan policy, PUSH adopted a common policy framework for affordable housing in January 2008. It included the following policy principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LDF policies should be informed by sub-regional evidence on the level of affordable housing need (as referenced in the South Hampshire Housing Market Assessment), and

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	White	White	Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	White	White	White	White	White	White	White	White	White	White	White	White	<p>the sub-region's past and future reliance on sites below 15 dwellings in size as part of overall housing supply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual authorities should prepare LDF policies that seek to ensure that residential developments within the city/district provide up to 40% affordable housing, and examine the need to vary affordable housing requirements in relation to site size. <p>Fareham BC Core Strategy policy CS18 concerns the provision of affordable housing. It requires the provision of affordable housing on all schemes that can deliver a net gain of 5 or more dwellings. Sites that are below the 15 dwelling threshold are expected to provide 30% affordable units or the equivalent financial contribution towards off-site provision. On sites that can accommodate 15 or more dwellings developers will be expected to provide 40% affordable units.</p> <p>Given the presence of the PUSH policy framework, over the long term, the scale of development in the sub-region is considered unlikely to change substantially in the absence of the South East Plan. However, current Local Plans are at minor variance with the overall commitment, albeit that some are yet to be adopted. In consequence, in the short and medium term this may introduce some delays into the process.</p> <p>Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of housing delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the South East Plan.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the South East Plan, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Plan is revoked or retained.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Yellow	White	Orange	Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Orange	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Orange	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy SH7: SUB-REGIONAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires that the transport and planning authorities will work together to: reduce the need to travel; manage the strategic transport network for longer distance journeys; and invest in new schemes to manage demand and provide additional public transport and highway capacity. A delivery agency, based upon Transport for South Hampshire, will be developed with the responsibility and necessary powers to manage and integrate public and private transport.</p> <p>Transport for South Hampshire (TfSH) was set up in late 2007 and is a partnership, between Hampshire County Council, and Portsmouth and Southampton city councils. The South East Plan policy commitments are reflected in the Local Transport Plan 3 Joint Strategy for South Hampshire, published in March 2011 and which covers sets the period to 2031. Key outcomes of the strategy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced dependence on the private car through an increased number of people choosing public transport and the 'active travel' modes of walking and cycling • Improved awareness of the different travel options available to people for their journeys, enabling informed choices about whether people travel, and how • Improved journey time reliability for all modes • Improved road safety within the sub-region • Improved accessibility within and beyond the sub-region

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved air quality and environment, and reduced greenhouse gas emissions Promoting a higher quality of life. <p>Significant positive scores for reducing the need to travel and reducing the transport intensity of economic activity, including freight – against criteria for reducing travel need, encouraging cycling and walking as well as reducing income disparities, increasing resilience and providing opportunities / access to services for all. The policy also seeks to improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Many of the effects will depend on the ability to change travel behaviour and the demand for transport. It is also uncertain what impacts transport infrastructure will have – particularly environmental impacts of new road construction.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Revocation of this policy will not affect the positive effects and outcomes identified. Transport for South Hampshire has been established and the Local Transport Plan sets out a vision, policies, and programme to deliver the policy over the long term. Revocation of the South East Plan leaves the partnership and policy commitments unaffected.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None</p> <p>Assumptions It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities will operate under the duty to cooperate to deliver positive outcomes.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Many of the effects will depend on the ability to change travel behaviour and the demand for transport. It is also uncertain what impacts transport infrastructure will have – particularly environmental impacts of new road construction.</p>

RS Policy SH8: ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary						
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L							
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires all LPAs in the South Hampshire to area develop common policies that secure more sustainable design and development. These include achieving greater connectivity through sustainable transport modes; greater access to green open space; integration of sustainable management and use of natural resources in infrastructure planning; ensuring effective coastal zone management and flood risk management; decreasing water use in all new development and ensuring that decisions on additional waste water treatment and water supply infrastructure are taken on the basis of environmental sustainability as well as cost. Partnership working with Southern Water, Portsmouth Water and the Environment Agency is recognised as key to the effective delivery of this policy.</p> <p>There will be significant positive effects on population & human health, water, air & climatic factors through the sustainable construction standards/techniques set out in this policy. These techniques will help to reduce water and energy use and have positive effects on air and climatic factors through reduced carbon emissions and for a proportion of energy to come from decentralised and renewable/low carbon sources.</p> <p>Given the amount of development proposed in the South East it will be critically important to limit the environmental impacts of new development. The Sustainability Appraisal undertaken of the South East Plan highlighted that there may still not be enough new homes being provided and so an even greater amount of housing could be required which would further highlight the importance of implementing this policy. The Sustainability Appraisal also suggested that overall the South East Plan was likely to have negative impacts on climate change, so incorporating the measures in this policy into existing buildings and new</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>development will help to limit climate change.</p> <p>There are no overall impacts on biodiversity, soils, cultural heritage and material assets.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>No mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The success of this policy would depend to some extent on behavioural changes by organisations and individuals to ensure implementation of the sustainable construction design/techniques.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of this policy will not affect the significant positive effects and outcomes identified.</p> <p>As paragraph 6 of the NPPF makes clear, the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF makes specific reference to the five 'guiding principles' of sustainable development set out in the UK Sustainable Development Strategy: <i>Securing the Future</i>. These are: living within the planet's environmental limits; ensuring a strong, healthy and just society; achieving a sustainable economy; promoting good governance; and using sound science responsibly. The policies in paragraphs 18 to 219, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system.</p> <p>Each of the elements contributing to the creation of sustainable communities described in 2003 Sustainable Communities: Homes for All are reflected in the NPPF, particularly in the core planning principles set out in paragraph 17, but also in more detail in specific policies.</p> <p>The revocation of this policy would not remove the requirement for local plans to be consistent with legal and national policy requirements on climate change: including supporting the move to a low carbon future and avoiding increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>from climate change. There should therefore be the same positive effects on climatic factors as with retention of the policy.</p> <p>There are measures in the NPPF to ensure that the challenge of climate change is met which includes seeking to move to a low carbon future and that local planning authorities should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Actively support energy efficiency to existing improvements; and</i> • <i>When setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, do so in a way consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards.</i> <p>The NPPF also places responsibility on all communities to help increase use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy development.</p> <p>The NPPF requires LPAs to adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations.</p> <p>In the absence of the South East Plan, the duty to co-operate will be an important element in continuing to deliver the positive effects, particularly in relation to strategic priorities (which includes climate change mitigation and adaptation). The commitments to sustainable transport are reflected in the Local Transport Plan. The commitments to improved water resource in planning and design and improved water infrastructure planning are reflected in water companies Water Resource Management Plans and the EA's River Basin Management Plans. For example, Southern Water's Water Resource Management Plan (2009 – 2014) includes measures that will deliver an average saving of 8% on unmeasured per capita consumption and 10% where properties have water metering. The Plan also notes 'A significant number of new homes are proposed for the South East over the planning period, many of which are expected to be flats or smaller dwellings, with a lower occupancy level than existing properties. In general, the lower the household occupancy rate, the higher the individual consumption. However, it has become mandatory for all new socially funded housing to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes code level 3 of 105 l/h/d (Defra 2008, Future Water). In the demand forecast it has therefore been assumed that, from the start of the planning period (2010-11) all new socially funded housing would have a PCC (per capita</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>consumption) of 105 l/h/d.'</p> <p>The Environment Agency's Shoreline Management Plan for the coastal areas in South Hampshire outlined specific responses (whether 'hold the line' or managed realignment) and work with land holders to ensure sea level changes are adequately addressed.</p> <p>All of these measures (the NPPF, the PUSH Housing Strategy, the Local Transport Plan, the Water Resource Management Plan, the River Basin Management Plan and the Shoreline Management Plan) will help to ensure new developments are sustainably designed and constructed, which would have positive effects on population, air and climatic factors.</p> <p>There will be no overall effects on biodiversity, soil, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>No mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>That the collectively operation of the framework of plans will deliver the commitments in the South East Plan.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The measures in the NPPF would require behavioural changes from organisations/individuals in order to move to a low carbon economy and so success would depend to some extent on this.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

RS Policy SH9: IMPLEMENTATION AGENCY

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires that an implementation agency will be created for South Hampshire with the responsibility and necessary powers to implement the policies for South Hampshire within the South East Plan.</p> <p>PUSH aims to deliver a shared vision of a more prosperous and sustainable South Hampshire. PUSH was formed in 2003 and initially comprised of the two unitary authorities, the county council and four of the district councils. This expanded in 2004 to the eleven councils that are now members of PUSH in recognition of the value that can be gained in working collaboratively towards growing our local economy.</p> <p>The effects of the policy are considered neutral. It is the actions of the implementation agency that would have potential effects (which are considered in the previous policy assessments).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>No mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Revocation would have no effect.</p> <p>PUSH was established in its current form in 2004 and has a strategy in place.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>The Solent Local Economic Partnership (LEP) is taking forward setting the conditions for economic development in the sub-region. The LEP now includes the Isle of Wight. The LEP focus for growth remains in the Portsmouth and Southampton area.</p> <p>The effects of the policy are considered neutral. As noted in the commentary on retention, it is the actions of the implementation agency that would have potential effects (which are considered in the previous policy assessments).</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> No mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> None</p>

RS Policy SCT1: CORE POLICY

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy states that local authorities and other agencies should, as a priority, pro-actively pursue and promote the sustainable economic growth and regeneration of the Sussex Coast. LPAs should aim to reduce intra-regional disparities and help bring the performance of the sub-regional economy up to the South East average. Growth is focused on sustainable urban extensions in Arun, Chichester (at the city or, if this is not possible, in other suitable and deliverable locations in the district), Rother and Wealden Districts and for major regeneration opportunities through a strategic development area (SDA) and Growth Point at Shoreham Harbour, including mixed use developments. The policy is seeking for a balanced approach to development, greater connectivity and to maintain the protection and enhancement of the sub-region's high environmental quality and nationally designated landscapes (in both town and country).</p> <p>The policy looks to create an additional 30,000 jobs between 2006 and 2016.</p> <p>There are potentially significant benefits on population from the creation of employment opportunities and housing; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on large urban extensions on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material assets, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the South East Plan (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>environment. In addition, there statutory duties on organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies (in this case Southern Water) to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for growth in the sub-region. Compared with South East averages there are higher levels of multiple deprivation, lower levels of GVA, lower earnings, higher levels of unemployment, lower rates of business formation, a poorer qualified workforce and an ageing population. It will not also remove the need for new homes.</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment opportunities and housing; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on large urban extensions on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material assets, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate).</p> <p>The Coast to Capital and South East Local Enterprise Partnerships provide a locally and private sector supported approach to support economic development and partnership working. The Coast to Capital LEP is based on a functional market economic area that goes across the regional boundary with London. Although it is acknowledged that LEPs are non-statutory bodies and are not subject to the duty to cooperate. the bodies that are subject to the duty are required to have regard to the activities of LEPs. This is intended to strengthen</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>strategic planning on economic activity and infrastructure delivery.</p> <p>Growth is focused on sustainable urban extensions in Arun, Chichester (at the city or, if this is not possible, in other suitable and deliverable locations in the district), Rother and Wealden Districts.</p> <p>In terms of the locations identified to provide for sustainable urban extensions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arun: as the South East Plan Panel report sets out in paragraph 17.61, this location is one of five identified for development after 2011 in the West Sussex Structure Plan (WSSP). However, revocation of this policy will result in uncertainty. This is because the relevant WSSP has not been saved see Appendix B. As set out in Appendix C, the Arun Local Plan was approved in 2003 and contains housing provision below that identified in this policy (and (SC5). Until a revised Local Plan is adopted with an updated assessment of housing need, it is uncertain whether the level of housing identified will be delivered in this district. Chichester: The South East Panel report noted in paragraph 17.67 that the Council was intending to provide a strategic location in its Core Strategy as a contingency for housing supply. The South East Plan allocated an additional housing to this location, with reasoning set out by the Panel in paragraph 17.68 of their report. As above, the WSSP identified this as a strategic location to accommodate a large urban extension, but the Structure Plan was not saved. Following an Inspectors report, the Council agreed the withdrawal of the Core Strategy on 24 July 2007 and so reverted to the Chichester Local Plan which was adopted in 1999. Therefore, there will be similar short and medium term delays to the benefits identified similarly to that for the Arun sustainable urban extension set out above. Rother: The Council is currently consulting on 'focused amendments' to the Proposed Submission Core Strategy. On 21st May 2012, the Council approved submission of the Core Strategy, incorporating some 'focused amendments' for independent examination, together with the updated Consultation Statement, Sustainability Appraisal, other supporting documents and copies of duly-made representations. The current Core Strategy includes revisions downward of housing allocations. It concludes that an

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Yellow			Light Green		Dark Green	Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Light Orange			Light Orange			Yellow			Yellow			<p>appropriate overall target for net additional housing in the district over the period from April 2011 to March 28 (17 years) should be some 3,700 - 4,100 dwellings, or an average of 218 - 241 dwellings/year. This compares to the figure in the SE Plan of 280 dwellings per year. The Core Strategy identifies two main reasons for this; firstly, the South East Plan assumed that the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road would be built by now, yet the earliest it can now be built is the very end of 2014. Secondly, the recent recession and ongoing weak national economic growth forecasts, mean that the prospect of actually increasing on past build rates, as implied by the South East Plan target of 280 dwellings/year) (compared to actual house-building between 1991 and 2011 of only 245 dwellings per year), is both likely to be unduly optimistic and, moreover, unlikely to be matched by requisite job growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wealden: this location was recommended by the Panel for additional housing via sustainable urban extension, see the Panel report paragraph 17.58- 17.60. The Wealden Local Plan was adopted in 1998. Therefore, the assessment on the impacts of revoking this SE Plan policy is similar to that for the Arun sustainable urban extension set out above. <p>The Policy also identified major regeneration opportunities through a strategic development area (SDA) and Growth Point at Shoreham Harbour, including mixed use developments. Brighton & Hove City Council is working with its partners (Adur District Council, West Sussex County Council, Shoreham Port Authority and the Homes and Communities Agency) to regenerate Shoreham Harbour. In 2011, Shoreham Harbour Interim Planning Guidance which sets out the position on growth and development, in anticipation developing an Area Action Plan by 2013. The IPG does not set out the quantum of growth anticipated.</p> <p>Given the current position of Core Strategies, AAPs, and Local Plan's, revocation of this South East Plan policy is likely to result in uncertainty in the short and medium term until policies have been adopted. This potentially will lead to delays in delivering development in these broad locations in the interim period.</p> <p>Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of housing delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary	
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L		
	Yellow	White	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	White	White	White	Yellow	White	White	White	White	White	Yellow	White	White		<p>to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty As with retention of the policy, in the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of development and housing is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy SCT2: ENABLING ECONOMIC REGENERATION

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy will assist regeneration in the central and eastern parts of the sub-region where the most pressing economic and social needs exist. Better east-west transport links, especially the A27/A259, will improve complementary connections with other key sub-regions and accessibility within the sub-region. Key measures should include: directing national and regional assistance and expenditure to promote the social and economic regeneration of areas in greatest need by: continuing the support being given to Hastings/Bexhill and Shoreham, whilst increasing the priority given to other parts of the Sussex Coast.</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment opportunities and housing; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on large urban extensions on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material assets, increased commuting along the principal road networks (A27/A259) leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment. In addition, there statutory duties on organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies (in this case Southern Water) to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for growth in the sub-region. Compared with South East averages there are higher levels of multiple deprivation, lower levels of GVA, lower earnings, higher levels of unemployment, lower rates of business formation, a poorer qualified workforce and an ageing population. It will not also remove the need for new homes.</p> <p>There are significant benefits on population from the creation of employment opportunities and improved connectivity; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on large urban extensions on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material assets, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate).</p> <p>The Coast to Capital and South East Local Enterprise Partnerships provide a locally and private sector supported approach to support economic development and partnership working. The Coast to Capital LEP is based on a functional market economic area that goes across the regional boundary with London. Shoreham Harbour regeneration is recognised in the 2010 Coast to Capital Strategy. Although it is acknowledged that LEPs are non-statutory bodies and are not subject to the duty to cooperate. However, the bodies that are subject to the duty are required to have regard to the activities of LEPs. This is intended to strengthen strategic planning on economic activity and infrastructure delivery.</p> <p>Regeneration is focused on Hastings and Bexhill area, reflected in the priority given to these</p>			

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Yellow			Orange			Green			Yellow			Orange			Orange			Orange			Orange			Orange			Orange			<p>areas in the submission Rother Core Strategy (Policy OSS1: Overall Spatial Development Strategy gives focus new development at Bexhill, giving particular attention to promoting economic regeneration and growth of the Hastings and Bexhill area, including through mixed use developments).</p> <p>The importance to Shoreham Harbour is also reflected in the 2011, Shoreham Harbour Interim Planning Guidance which sets out the position on growth and development, in anticipation developing an Area Action Plan by 2013. The IPG does not set out the quantum of growth anticipated.</p> <p>Given the current position of Rother Core Strategy and Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan, revocation of this South East Plan policy is likely to result in uncertainty in the short and medium term until policies have been adopted.</p> <p>Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of development delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of development is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy SCT3: MANAGEMENT OF EXISTING EMPLOYMENT SITES AND PREMISES

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy requires that local authorities should deliver sufficient appropriate sites and premises for business and other uses that will help to facilitate the regeneration of the local economy. Several key strategic employment sites and business park allocations have remained undeveloped, particularly in East Sussex, and drawing attention to them in Policy SCT3 will help unlock their potential by promoting effective delivery mechanisms. This includes developing and co-ordinate with other agencies. Sites include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • large-scale, mixed-use development sites at Worthing and north of Bognor Regis • Shoreham Harbour, Airport and Cement Works • Newhaven Eastside and Port • Eastbourne Park and Sovereign Harbour • Polegate mixed-use development sites at North East Bexhill. <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material assets, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate).</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary				
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L					
																															<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the development provision on the environment. In addition, there are statutory duties on organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies (in this case Southern Water) to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>	
Revocation	0	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for employment opportunities within the sub-region. Compared with South East averages there are higher levels of multiple deprivation, lower levels of GVA, lower earnings, higher levels of unemployment, lower rates of business formation, a poorer qualified workforce.</p> <p>There are significant benefits on population from the creation of employment opportunities and improved connectivity; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on large urban extensions on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material assets, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate).</p> <p>The Coast to Capital LEP provide a locally and private sector supported approach to support economic development and partnership working. Of the sites mentioned in the policy,</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	<p>Shoreham Harbour regeneration is recognised in the 2010 Coast to Capital Strategy.</p> <p>Brighton & Hove City Council is working with its partners (Adur District Council, West Sussex County Council, Shoreham Port Authority and the Homes and Communities Agency) to regenerate Shoreham Harbour (to be reflected in the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan).</p> <p>The LEP has submitted proposals for the Bognor Regis Enterprise Zone to central government to stimulate regeneration and development.</p> <p>Regeneration is focused on Hastings and Bexhill area, reflected in the priority given to these areas in the submission Rother Core Strategy (Policy OSS1: Overall Spatial Development Strategy gives focus new development at Bexhill, giving particular attention to promoting economic regeneration and growth of the Hastings and Bexhill area, including through mixed use developments).</p> <p>The continued focus given by this policy is maintained by the LEP, in conjunction with LPAs and the HCA. However, whilst the LEPs proposals are moving forward, regeneration of Bexhill and Shoreham Harbour are dependent on progress on the Rother Core Strategy and Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan. In consequence, revocation of this South East Plan policy is likely to result in uncertainty in the short and medium term until policies have been adopted.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects are likely to be less in the short and medium term.</p>

RS Policy SCT4: EMPLOYMENT PRIORITY IN NEW LAND ALLOCATIONS

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy sets out that LPAs should give priority to delivering employment development in strategically accessible locations, particularly by rail, to ensure an appropriate mix of readily available sites and premises whilst also providing sufficient space to: retain existing firms and enable their expansion or relocation (within the sub-region); and create opportunities for inward investment. New employment allocations should be included as appropriate within sustainable urban extensions in Arun, Chichester, Rother and Wealden districts.</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment. The key environmental effects of the policy are linked to reduced travel (particularly through opportunities for more public transport) and the benefits that this has for air quality and climatic factors.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Traffic management measures and policies to encourage non-car modes of transport set out elsewhere in the regional strategy would reduce the negative effects of air pollution in town centres.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The actual effects on biodiversity, soil, water, air quality, climate change and material assets will depend on the degree to which the policy effectively balances the demands for out of</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															centre sites (potentially on greenfield locations) and inner city development and intensification (most likely to involve the reuse of previously developed land). The Plan notes that much of the current development pipeline for business growth is out of town, the main centres have capacity and potential to accommodate most of the forecast growth requirements over the Plan period. As such the effects over the medium and long term are recorded as uncertain.
Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	0	?	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for employment opportunities within the sub-region.</p> <p>The continued focus given by this policy is maintained by the LEP, in conjunction with LPAs and the HCA. However, whilst the LEPs proposals are moving forward, regeneration of Bexhill and Shoreham Harbour are dependent on progress on the Rother Core Strategy and Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan. In consequence, revocation of this South East Plan policy is likely to result in uncertainty in the short and medium term until policies have been adopted.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, in the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects are likely to be less in the short and medium term.</p>

RS Policy SCT5: HOUSING DISTRIBUTION

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy requires the Sussex Coast LPAs to allocate sufficient land and facilitate the delivery of 69,300 net additional dwellings in the Sussex Coast between 2006 and 2026. This is split between the named authorities (Adur, Shoreham Harbour SDA, Arun, Brighton & Hove, Chichester (part), Eastbourne, Hastings, Lewes, Rother, Wealden, Worthing).</p> <p>The increased provision of housing is likely to lead to significantly positive effects on the population and human health in the medium to long term. However, this will also depend on related factors such as the quality of the houses, their density, location relative to green spaces and ambient air quality.</p> <p>The demand for construction materials, water and energy is likely to increase, as is traffic in the region, while the amount of waste generated is also likely to increase. This is likely to have negative impacts on water resources, material assets, air quality and climatic factors. The provision of land is likely to include green field sites which will have an adverse impact on biodiversity and soil. The impact on cultural heritage and landscape is uncertain.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment. In addition, there are statutory duties on organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies (in this case Southern Water) to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for more houses within the sub-region. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities in order to achieve this objective. Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it may have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur, subject to the status of local plans.</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of housing; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on large urban extensions on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material assets, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate).</p> <p>Growth is focused on sustainable urban extensions in Arun, Chichester (at the city or, if this is not possible, in other suitable and deliverable locations in the district), Rother and Wealden Districts.</p> <p>In terms of the locations identified to provide for sustainable urban extensions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arun: as the South East Plan Panel report sets out in paragraph 17.61, this location is one of five identified for development after 2011 in the West Sussex Structure Plan 			

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Yellow					Green	Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			<p>(WSSP). However, revocation of this policy will result in uncertainty. This is because the relevant WSSP have not been saved see Appendix B. As set out in Appendix C, the Arun Local Plan was approved in 2003 and contains housing provision below that identified in this policy (and (SC5)). Until a revised Local Plan is adopted with an updated assessment of housing need, it is uncertain whether the level of housing identified will be delivered in this district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chichester: The South East Panel report noted in paragraph 17.67 that the Council were intending to provide a strategic location in its Core Strategy as a contingency for housing supply. The SE Plan allocated additional housing to this location, with reasoning set out by the Panel in paragraph 17.68 of their report. As above, the WSSP identified this as a strategic location to accommodate a large urban extension, but the Structure Plan was not saved. Following an Inspector's report, the Council agreed the withdrawal of the Core Strategy on 24 July 2007 and so reverted to the Chichester Local Plan which was adopted in 1999. Therefore, there will be similar short and medium term delays to the benefits identified similarly to that for the Arun sustainable urban extension set out above. Rother: The Council is currently consulting on 'focused amendments' to the Proposed Submission Core Strategy. On 21st May 2012, the Council approved submission of the Core Strategy, incorporating some 'focused amendments' for independent examination, together with the updated Consultation Statement, Sustainability Appraisal, other supporting documents and copies of duly-made representations. The current Core Strategy includes revisions downward of housing allocations. It concludes that an appropriate overall target for net additional housing in the district over the period from April 2011 to March 28 (17 years) should be some 3,700 - 4,100 dwellings, or an average of 218 - 241 dwellings/year. This compares to the figure in the SE Plan of 280 dwellings per year. The Core Strategy identifies two main reasons for this; firstly, the South East Plan assumed that the Bexhill to Hastings Link Road would be built by now, yet the earliest it can now be built is the very end of 2014. Secondly, the recent recession and ongoing weak national economic growth forecasts, mean that the prospect of actually increasing on past build rates, as implied by the South East Plan

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>target of 280 dwellings/year) (compared to actual house-building between 1991 and 2011 of only 245 dwellings per year), is both likely to be unduly optimistic and, moreover, unlikely to be matched by requisite job growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wealden: this location was recommended by the Panel for additional housing via sustainable urban extension, see the Panel report paragraph 17.58- 17.60. The Wealden Local Plan was adopted in 1998. Therefore, the assessment on the impacts of revoking this policy is similar to that for the Arun sustainable urban extension set out above. <p>The Policy also identified major regeneration opportunities through a strategic development area (SDA) and Growth Point at Shoreham Harbour, including mixed use developments. Brighton & Hove City Council is working with its partners (Adur District Council, West Sussex County Council, Shoreham Port Authority and the Homes and Communities Agency) to regenerate Shoreham Harbour. In 2011, Shoreham Harbour Interim Planning Guidance which sets out the position on growth and development, in anticipation developing an Area Action Plan by 2013. The IPG does not set out the quantum of growth anticipated.</p> <p>Given the current position of Core Strategies, AAPs, and Local Plan's, revocation of this South East Plan policy is likely to result in uncertainty in the short and medium term until policies have been adopted. This potentially will lead to delays in delivering development in these broad locations in the interim period.</p> <p>Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of housing delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary	
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L		
	Yellow	White	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Orange	Orange	Orange	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White		retained. Uncertainty As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of development and housing is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.

RS Policy SCT6: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy sets that LPAs should undertake up to date assessments of housing need to establish appropriate policies and local targets for the provision of affordable housing in their area. Such policies and targets should comply with the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. the appropriate proportion of affordable housing sought should be the maximum that the viability of particular developments can support, bearing in mind the likely contributions towards the provision of infrastructure required under Policy CC7 and the Implementation Plan ii. as a general guideline, 40% of new housing development should be affordable housing iii. this guideline should not restrain local authorities from seeking a higher or lower proportion of affordable housing provision where local circumstances clearly justify it <p>Increased provision of affordable housing will have significant benefits to the population and human health. The policy and hence its benefits will be very much dependent upon the market being able/willing to deliver the level of affordable housing proposed.</p> <p>There may be short term benefits to the soil topic through the use of vacant buildings and brownfield land; however, in order to meet the targets and receive a long term gain, it is inevitable that there will be development on greenfield land. The quality of the housing delivered will determine whether the development creates an attractive environment and therefore the impact on landscape is uncertain. The extent and type of development on</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>greenfield land will also influence the impact on biodiversity which remains uncertain. Increased development will have an adverse impact on water resources and material assets. The policy could potentially help reduce the need to travel if the delivery of affordable housing meant that people in need of such housing lived close to where they work. The opposite effects would occur if the location of affordable houses led to greater travel distances.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for more affordable houses within the sub-region and the revocation of the policy is unlikely affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it will have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur.</p> <p>Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes . Paragraph 47 of the NPPF seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing and states that local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their local plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for affordable housing. This is expected to have the same significant benefits to the population and human</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>health as retention of the policy, although as with revocation of policy H1 there could be fewer benefits to the population in the short term in those local authorities without an up to date plan.</p> <p>Chichester and Wealden Local Plans were adopted considerably before the South East Plan. The wording is noticeably more flexible and less directive. For example, Policy HG2 in the Wealden Plan states ‘... where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs, the Council will seek the provision of an element of affordable housing in new, large-scale housing developments.’</p> <p>The Rother Proposed Submission Core Strategy includes the following: ‘On housing sites or mixed use developments, the Council will expect the following percentages of affordable housing within the district: (i) In Bexhill and Hastings Fringes, 30% on-site affordable housing on schemes of 15 or more dwellings (or 0.5 hectares or more); (ii) In Rye, 30% on-site affordable housing on schemes of 10 or more dwellings (or 0.3 hectares or more); (iii) In Battle, 35% on-site affordable housing on schemes of 10 or more dwellings (or 0.3 hectares or more); (iv) In the Rural Areas: a) 40% on-site affordable housing on schemes of 5 dwellings or more; or b) A financial contribution, on a sliding scale up to the equivalent of providing 40% affordable housing, in lieu of on-site provision on all residential schemes of less than 5 dwellings.’</p> <p>Given the current position of Core Strategies, AAPs, and Local Plan’s, revocation of this South East Plan policy may result in uncertainty in the short and medium term until policies have been adopted. This potentially will lead to delays in delivering the benefits associated with this policy. Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of housing delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Yellow			Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Orange			Yellow			Orange			Yellow			Yellow			<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy SCT7: IMPLEMENTATION AND DELIVERY

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires that Local authorities, regional agencies, government representatives and other key stakeholders should agree a long-term vision and together develop joint, multi-agency plans and frameworks as a focus for delivering economic and social regeneration for the sub-region. This includes the following names areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hastings – Bexhill area • Eastbourne – Hailsham area • Shoreham – Brighton & Hove and Adur • Newhaven area • coastal West Sussex from Selsey to Adur <p>The effects of the policy are considered neutral. It is the actions of the implementation agency that would have potential effects (which are considered in the previous policy assessments).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>No mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
																											<p>Uncertainty None</p>	
Revocation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention Revocation would have no effect.</p> <p>The Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnerships provide a locally and private sector supported approach to support economic development and partnership working. It comprises of five interlocking local economies which function as a natural economy. The economies are represented by five Area Partnerships: Brighton & Hove Economic Partnership; Coastal West Sussex; Croydon Development and Cultural Partnership; Gatwick Diamond Initiative; and Rural West Sussex.</p> <p>The 2010 LEP Strategy provides a vision, commitments and governance structure.</p> <p>The continued focus given by this policy is maintained by the LEP, in conjunction with LPAs and the HCA.</p> <p>The effects of the policy are considered neutral. As noted in the commentary on retention, it is the actions of the implementation agency that would have potential effects (which are considered in the previous policy assessments).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures No mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainty None</p>	

RS Policy EKA1: Core Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy provides the core strategy for economic development in the East Kent and Ashford Sub-regional Strategy Area and provides an estimate of 50,000 additional jobs between 2006 – 2016.</p> <p>New development is to be primarily accommodated through expansion of Ashford and other settlements served by the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL). Coastal towns, especially Dover, are to develop international gateway roles; Canterbury is to develop links between University research and business, while maintaining commercial activity and as an internationally important historic centre. Necessary infrastructure is to be provided.</p> <p>The provision of additional housing and stimulus to business will have a significant positive impact on the economy of the area, and the health of the population.</p> <p>New economic development, and associated residential development, will present a significant adverse impact on scarce water supply, and may also have an adverse impact on water quality, which in turn could impact on the quality of wetland habitats.</p> <p>CTRL is seen as a major driver for development. However additional infrastructure is to be provided and is likely to have an adverse effect on air quality and climate issues.</p> <p>Some green field development is envisaged for the Dover Growth Point. This would have an adverse impact on soils and biodiversity.</p> <p>As with any policy which promotes growth and development, there will be an adverse impact on material assets resulting from the use of building materials, and greater pressure on waste</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>management.</p> <p>Dover is designated as a Growth Point for high quality regeneration. The townscape in urban centres, particularly where significant growth is envisaged (Ashford and Dover) would benefit from high quality regeneration. Integrated measures to improve heritage would have a positive impact on cultural heritage.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures taken by water companies to reduce water loss and 'per capita' water usage.</p> <p>Effects on biodiversity arising from green field development would be mitigated by policy NRM5..</p> <p>Policy EKA2 seeks to ensure sustainable development and minimal environmental impact.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Economic factors conducive to achieving development objectives. Effective improvement of cultural heritage and townscape.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Economic factors will affect the rate of development in the area, and detail will be dependent on individual local plans.</p>
Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Dover and Ashford are regionally designated growth areas and have adopted Core Strategies. The Dover Core Strategy was adopted in February 2010 and was informed by the South East Plan. The Ashford Core Strategy was adopted in July 2008, and sets out a vision that 'Ashford will meet the growth ambitions established in the Government's Sustainable Communities Plan and the more specific targets in the emerging South East Plan...'. The Ashford CS is predicated on ensuring growth. The area is included within the South East Local Economic Partnership (LEP) which has the goal of promoting 'steady, sustained</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	<p><i>economic growth over the next two decades’.</i></p> <p>The NPPF sets out a strong policy on conserving and enhancing the historic environment (section 12) which will have particular relevance to Canterbury, a recognised centre of international historic importance. It also requires local authorities to set out strategic priorities for each area (paragraph156) and each authority has a duty to co-operate with neighbouring authorities and other public/private sector bodies. The latter would include the LEP.</p> <p>Revocation of the RS means that the local authorities would take forward local plans in the context of the NPPF and would have no obligation to rely on the policies established by the South East Plan. The plan for Dover is compliant with the South East Plan, the plan for Ashford took into account the emerging South East Plan. Of the other authorities in the sub-region the local plans for Thanet, Canterbury and Shepway were adopted in 2006. Swale is consulting on its Core Strategy following adoption of the local plan in February2008. These planning authorities may interpret their local requirements in an alternative manner to that intended by the South East Plan.</p> <p>Until local authorities have produced their strategic plans there will be underlying uncertainty in the short and medium term regarding the areas which are to be targeted for development. Therefore the positive benefits of the policy to economic growth and to the health of the population may be delayed. As a consequence any adverse environmental impacts associated with this development would also be delayed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Local authorities provide details of strategic development objectives in a timely manner.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Speed at which there is clarity in the strategic objectives for the region. Economic factors influencing the rate of development.</p>

RS Policy EKA2: Spatial Framework for Ashford Growth Area

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy states that new development is to be achieved through urban intensification combined with the development of new sustainable urban extensions. Growth is to follow the principles of sustainable development including efficient use of resources, strategic planning of SUDS, and timely provision of infrastructure.</p> <p>Growth would lead to economic improvement and have a significant positive impact on population.</p> <p>The adoption of an enhanced bus-based public transport system should reduce impacts on air quality and climate, although the gains may be offset by increased, development related, use of transport.</p> <p>More efficient use of water, energy and waste will ensure that development does not present a negative impact on water, climate and material assets giving a neutral net impact on water and climate. Use of construction materials will have an adverse impact on material assets. Management of the urban fringe for biodiversity and recreation will have a positive impact on biodiversity, human health and landscape, although development on green field land may offset the benefits to biodiversity and landscape.</p> <p>The measures proposed should ensure that additional development does not have a net adverse impact on the majority of environmental aspects although the extent to which these aspects would be improved above the current status is uncertain. Measures proposed to improve the physical fabric of the area should lead to overall environmental benefits to water quality and townscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality,</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Sustainability measures aim to offset impacts of additional growth. Uncertainty regarding the extent to which environmental aspects will be improved above current status.</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The Ashford Core Strategy was adopted in July 2008, and sets out a vision that ‘Ashford will meet the growth ambitions established in the Government’s Sustainable Communities Plan and the more specific targets in the emerging South East Plan...’ As stated in the RS policy, this vision would be based on a growth model involving the existing urban area of Ashford Town and a small number of ‘sustainable urban extensions’. The vision is supported by Policy CS1 which provides the guiding principles for sustainable development.</p> <p>The Core Strategy is under review but the NPPF is committed to sustainable development and states that ‘...economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system’ (para. 8). Therefore the framework provides for similar environmental benefits to the RS. Good design is considered by the NPPF to be a key aspect of sustainable development (para. 56).</p> <p>The overall principles of the Ashford Growth area are well established and it is unlikely that revocation of the RS would result in a change in these plans. The impacts arising from revocation are the same as those which are predicted for implementation of the RS.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p>	

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow			Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow	Light Orange	Light Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow			<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Uncertainty regarding the net environmental effect of integrating sustainability measures into proposed growth.</p>

RS Policy EKA3: Amount and Distribution of Housing

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy clearly defines the housing allocations (56,700) for Ashford, Canterbury, Dover, Thanet, Shepway and Swale. This policy should have a significant positive effect on the economy by providing clear guidance on housing need. By inclusion of a target of 30% affordable housing this will have significant benefit to human health.</p> <p>Growth is to be supported by co-ordinated provision of infrastructure, employment, environmental improvement and community services.</p> <p>Part of the housing strategy (EKA1) requires development on green field land around Dover and this would have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape. Increased private transport generated by this policy would have an adverse impact on air quality which would also impact adversely on climate. The use of construction materials will deplete material assets. Increased residential development would have a significant adverse impact on water resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policy EKA2 requires significant improvements to water related demand measures and strategic planning of sewerage infrastructure in Ashford. Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Economic conditions support this level of 'new build'.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Sustainability measures aim to offset impacts of additional growth. There remains uncertainty regarding the extent to which environmental aspects would be improved above existing. Another uncertainty is the extent of economic growth in the sub-region.</p>
Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for more houses within the sub-region. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities to achieve this objective. Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it may have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur, subject to the status of existing local plans.</p> <p>The Core Strategies for Dover, Ashford, and Swale were adopted in 2008 or later and the housing allocations in these documents reflect, at a minimum, the draft South East Plan provision, being approximately 60% of the total for the sub-region. Revocation of the RS would mean that there would be some uncertainty regarding the targets in the remaining three districts – Shepway, Thanet and Canterbury. Consequently a delay is predicted in achieving development targets, with a consequential impact on the economy and population.</p> <p>The NPPF policies relating to sustainable development and protection of the environment would ensure that the overall requirements of EKA2 (revoked) are met. Similar environmental impacts associated with development are predicted, although there is likely to be a delay in these occurring. The extent of this delay is uncertain.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p>	

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	White	Orange	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	White	Orange	Yellow	White	Orange	Yellow	White	Orange	Yellow	White	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	White	Orange	<p>Uncertainty Development plans in preparation. Extent to which policies relating to sustainability offset the adverse environmental impacts associated with development.</p>

RS Policy EKA4: Urban Renaissance of the Coastal Towns

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy identifies specific coastal areas for regeneration including: concentration of employment in small businesses, education and culture in Folkestone, Margate and Dover; a regional role for Kent International Airport (Manston); expansion of Port Ramsgate; growth of pharmaceuticals at Sandwich; regeneration of former colliery sites; development of local service functions in smaller towns; new measures to create employment in Shepway following decommissioning of Dungeness.</p> <p>The regeneration of coastal towns and communities brings benefits to the economy and population.</p> <p>Regeneration to create high quality urban environments would improve the townscape and is likely to have a positive impact on cultural heritage. The proposed regeneration of former colliery sites could have a positive impact on biodiversity.</p> <p>This regeneration will potentially increase traffic and have an adverse effect on air quality and climate.</p> <p>As with any policy which promotes growth and development, there will be an adverse impact on material assets resulting from the use of building materials and greater pressure on waste management. There is also likely to be an adverse impact associated with demand for water resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Proposed improvements to public transport in the area could mitigate aerial emissions from increased traffic generated as a consequence of the policy. Policies throughout the plan</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the environment.</p> <p>Assumptions There are no negative effects on nationally and internationally significant wildlife sites.</p> <p>Uncertainty Development of the coast, while bringing economic benefit to the region, can have negative effects on biodiversity including to internationally designated site (e.g. SAC and Ramsar). The requirements of the Habitats Directive enable such development only when there are no alternatives and the development is considered to be imperative for reasons of overriding public interest and subject to the delivery of compensatory measures.</p> <p>There are potentially negative effects on air quality and climatic factors from shipping which are uncertain and not considered here.</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	?		-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	+	0	?	+			<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Since the RS was adopted, Pfizer has announced closure of the pharmaceutical research facility at Sandwich. The South East LEP has been successful in securing Enterprise Zone Status for the site which should encourage development to offset the closure, together with a grant for flood defence which will have a significant effect on controlling flooding. In addition the Expansion East Kent growth fund has been approved to provide incentives for investors in the region, which includes the coastal areas.</p> <p>There is a duty on local authorities to cooperate with organisations including the LEP which has been formed to promote economic growth and to contribute to strategic development in the region.</p> <p>Of the three local areas affected by this policy, two (Shepway and Thanet) adopted local plans in 2006 and were not influenced by the emerging South East Plan. In the absence of the RS, development is likely to be guided by the existing local plans although the authorities may rely on evidence collated in preparation of the RS. Until the local authorities have confirmed strategic objectives, as required by the NPPF, there remains some uncertainty regarding policies in Shepway and Thanet and this may delay economic and physical regeneration.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	White	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	Light Green	Yellow	White	Light Green	<p>A delay could reduce the potential economic benefit to the region, and would also result in less improvement in cultural heritage, landscape and biodiversity. There may be a positive effect of lower air quality impacts and associated influence on climatic factors. The timing of these impacts is uncertain.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Enterprise Zone status for the Pfizer 'Discovery' Park; and the Expansion East Kent growth fund to stimulate economic regeneration in the area.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Development of the coast, while bringing economic benefit to the region, can have negative effects on biodiversity including to internationally designated site (e.g. SAC and Ramsar). The requirements of the Habitats Directive enable such development only when there are no alternatives and the development is considered to be imperative for reasons of overriding public interest and subject to the delivery of compensatory measures.</p> <p>There are potentially negative effects on air quality and climatic factors from shipping which are uncertain and not considered here.</p>

RS Policy EKA5: The Gateway Role.

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy provides support to gateways as catalysts for economic development, including freight and tourism. This encompasses appropriate development of the Ports of Dover and Ramsgate, and support to regional growth of Kent International Airport.</p> <p>This policy would have a significant positive benefit to the economy by promoting tourism and industry which would benefit the population.</p> <p>There would be a negative impact on air quality arising from higher traffic movements (both for air and ports), combined with increased aerial emissions from aircraft. This would have an adverse effect on climate change. There could be a negative impact on water supply, if more people are attracted to the area, increasing consumption. There are also potential adverse impacts on biodiversity, arising from air pollution and bird strike (aircraft).</p> <p>Dependent on the extent of new construction required there would be an adverse impact on material assets. Construction, which could include expansion of Kent International Airport together with ancillary facilities, would involve additional land take which, in turn, would have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty National aviation policy will set the parameters for whether there is significant expansion of air travel in the region.</p>
Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The Dover Core Strategy accords with the objectives of the South East Plan in relation to the port of Dover. Thanet District Council is supporting a Masterplan for Ramsgate Port and Harbour. There is a duty under the NPPF for local authorities to co-operate across boundaries on strategic issues, and to ensure that strategic priorities are set. It is probable that development connected with the ports would proceed in a similar way to that envisaged by the South East Plan and that impacts would be similar, both on economic development and environmental aspects.</p> <p>National aviation policy will set the parameters for whether there is a significant expansion of air travel in the region. When planning for ports, airports and airfields that are not subject to a separate national policy statement paragraph 33 of the NPPF states that <i>'plans should take account of their growth and role in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs.'</i> Plans are to take into account this Framework, as well as the principles set out in the relevant national policy statements and the Government Framework for UK Aviation.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of revocation of the RS are similar to retention.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	<p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None</p>

RS Policy EKA6: Employment Locations

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy gives priority to completion of major employment sites at Ashford, Canterbury City, Dover, Richborough, Folkestone-Hythe and Thanet. If required new locations are to be provided at Ashford and Dover. Sites are identified for intensification/expansion of technology, knowledge and scientific sectors at Canterbury, Dover and Ashford. Higher and further education is to be expanded in Canterbury and new investment for these sectors provided in Ashford, Folkestone and Dover.</p> <p>The location of employment zones is clearly identified and will provide certainty for economic investment which will have a significant positive effect on the economy and population.</p> <p>There are potential associated negative effects on environmental aspects. The promotion of employment is likely to encourage greater use of private travel which will have an adverse impact on air quality and climate. Greater employment will encourage more people into the region, with associated requirement for water resources.</p> <p>Greater employment is also likely to generate greater quantities of commercial and industrial waste which will require treatment and disposal, placing pressure on limited waste facilities. Development associated with employment expansion will use construction materials and have an adverse impact on material assets.</p> <p>Development pressure in these employment locations could have an adverse impact on biodiversity and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															natural environment. <u>Assumptions</u> None <u>Uncertainty</u> Rate of economic development will be governed by regional and national economic conditions.
Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	<u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u> Half of the local authorities included within the area have produced Core Strategies which were developed alongside the consultations for the South East Plan and therefore reflect the intentions of the Regional Strategy. Until all local planning authorities have adopted up-to-date plans there will be some uncertainty which could delay decisions, and the development may not accord with previously established priorities. The South East LEP has secured investment in East Kent from the Regional Growth Fund (RGF) and this will assist in stimulating employment (predicted 5 000 jobs). Therefore employment investment will proceed and provide a positive benefit to the economy and population. As the funding has been secured the timescale for implementation is likely to be similar to that which would be achieved with the RS in place. There are potential associated negative effects on environmental aspects. The promotion of employment is likely to encourage greater use of private travel which will have an adverse impact on air quality and climate. Greater employment will encourage more people into the region, with associated requirement for water resources. Greater employment is also likely to generate greater quantities of commercial and industrial waste which will require treatment and disposal, placing pressure on limited waste facilities. Development associated with employment expansion will use construction materials and have an adverse impact on material assets.

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	<p>Development pressure in these employment locations could have an adverse impact on biodiversity and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Adoption of transport plans to reduce the impacts of travel on air quality and climate (NPPF section 4). Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Rate of economic development will be governed by regional and national economic conditions.</p>

RS Policy EKA7: Integrated Coastal Management and Natural Park

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy establishes a joint policy framework to co-ordinate the development, management and use of the coastal zone to include conservation and enhancement of internationally important sites, together with positive conservation management for the Lower Stour. These measures will have a significant positive impact on biodiversity.</p> <p>The integrated approach includes enhancement of opportunities for visitor access and recreation which would provide a significant benefit to human health, and the identification of commercial opportunities which would provide economic benefit. The increased tourism and commercial activity could increase road traffic unless provision is made for more sustainable transport modes, resulting in a localised and small negative impact on air quality and climate. The magnitude of these impacts is uncertain.</p> <p>The policy also embraces conservation and enhancement of the built environment which would have a significant positive impact on town and landscape.</p> <p>All measures are to be carried out in accordance with proposed coastal defence measures which will impact positively on flood defence.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Funding becomes available to implement proposed enhancement for nature conservation and</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>visitor access in the Lower Stour.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As above. The extent of transport related air pollution arising from the development of public access, recreation and tourism.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Existing wildlife legislation protects sites of national and international importance for wildlife. The NPPF contains policies on climate change, flooding and coastal change (section 10) and conserving and enhancing the natural environment (section 11). Paragraph 105 states that local planning authorities are required to apply Integrated Coastal Zone Management across local authority and land/sea boundaries. They should also reduce risk from coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development in vulnerable areas. Paragraph 114 provides for the maintenance of the character of the undeveloped coast, protecting and enhancing its distinctive landscapes, particularly in areas defined as Heritage Coast, and improvement to public access to, and enjoyment of, the coast.</p> <p>Paragraph 156 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to set out strategic policies for the area, including for “<i>climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape</i>”. In addition Shoreline Management Plans should continue to inform the evidence base for planning in coastal areas (paragraph 168).</p> <p>Public authorities have a duty to co-operate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly in relation to strategic priorities as identified in paragraph 156 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF policies, in combination with existing legislation, provide the framework for delivery of this policy. However, the proposals for the Lower Stour wetland are within Thanet District. The Thanet Local Plan was adopted in 2006, and not within the timeframe of the South East Plan. There is uncertainty as to whether the local authority would comply with the proposals for the Lower Stour.</p> <p>Overall the NPPF will provide significant benefit to biodiversity, landscape/townscape, and</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>provide greater recreation opportunities which will benefit human health. The impact of any tourism development on transport and air emissions is uncertain.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None</p> <p>Assumptions Local focus remains on improvements to the Lower Stour.</p> <p>Uncertainty A local decision is taken to focus on enhancing the Lower Stour. Funding becomes available to implement proposed enhancement for nature conservation and visitor access in the Lower Stour. Extent of transport related air pollution from recreation and tourism.</p>

RS Policy EKA8: Effective Delivery

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy establishes that the structure of the Ashford Delivery Board is to be reviewed as growth progresses. Private and public sources of funding are to be sought to fund strategic infrastructure. The policy identifies a need to examine infrastructure provision and development in other parts of East Kent as a basis for prioritisation. Key transport issues are located around Ashford, Dover and Canterbury and water supply across the region is also important to growth.</p> <p>Establishment of a mechanism for effective delivery of infrastructure would have a positive effect on implementation providing significant economic benefit to the population. Enhancement of the water supply to meet the needs of commercial and residential development would be a positive benefit.</p> <p>An improved transport network could have positive or negative benefits on air quality and climate, dependent on the extent to which development of public transport mitigates against greater use of private vehicles.</p> <p>Infrastructure construction will have an adverse impact on material assets and there may be secondary adverse impacts of infrastructure construction on biodiversity, soils and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Detail regarding the transport infrastructure, and component of 'green' transport. Secondary impacts arising from construction activities connected with transport and the provision of infrastructure for water provision.</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The South East LEP has been established with the objective of enabling sustainable development. One of its four core objectives relates to improvement of the Strategic Transport Infrastructure. The transport objectives of the RS policy would therefore be met.</p> <p>Following the Government's 2011 White Paper '<i>Water for Life</i>', greater guidance will be provided by the Environment Agency and Ofwat to water companies on long term planning and measures to reduce demand.</p> <p>It is anticipated that these initiatives will deliver the objectives of the RS policy and that there will be similar potential environmental impacts.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies within the NPPF that seek to promote good design and minimise waste arisings will seek to minimise the negative effects on material assets.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Detail regarding the transport infrastructure, and component of 'green' transport. Secondary impacts arising from construction activities connected with transport and the provision of infrastructure for water provision.</p>	

RS Policy KTG1: Core Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy aims to achieve transformational change in the scale and character of the economy, focusing on development of urban areas and creating a high quality environment. Major development is focused to exploit the regional hubs at Ebbsfleet, the Medway Towns and locations served by CTRL and is to make full use of previously developed land before greenfield sites.</p> <p>The strategy provides for an estimated 58,000 jobs (KTG 2) and 52,100 dwellings (KTG 4) in the plan period.</p> <p>Emphasis on economic development, increased standards of skills and education in the workforce and an increased supply of new housing, including affordable housing, will have a significant positive impact on the population. Protection to the Metropolitan Green Belt and the AONB will provide positive benefit to biodiversity and landscape although, if development outside previously developed land is required, this could have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soils and landscape. The net effect on these aspects is uncertain, from neutral to minor negative, dependent on the location of development. Establishment of high design standards, and improvement of existing urban areas, will benefit cultural heritage and townscape. The residual impact on biodiversity, soils and landscape/townscape is uncertain.</p> <p>As with any policy which promotes growth and development, there will be adverse effects on material assets resulting from the use of building materials, and greater pressure on waste management. Given the proposed scale of the growth there is a potentially significant adverse impact associated with the demand for water. The policy includes measures to encourage more sustainable travel including transfer of freight from road to rail and water. In view of the</p>		

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil		Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary				
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M		L			
																															<p>scale of development proposed an adverse impact on local air quality from vehicle emissions and on climate is considered likely.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty The extent of development outside previously developed land, and the consequential impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	+	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The Kent Thames Gateway Partnership has been established and comprises regional local authority and private sector representation. Its role is to: attract investment for the delivery of sustainable private sector economic growth; promote public private sector collaboration; work with partners across boundaries to stimulate economic development in the sub-region and facilitate economic growth and investment. It has established 10 economic objectives including for job creation (58,000 by 2026) and new homes (52,000 in the same period). This partnership, together with the South East Local Economic Partnership (LEP) is taking forward setting the conditions for economic development in the sub-region.</p> <p>Local authorities are under a duty to co-operate across regional boundaries, and with other organisations including LEPs.</p> <p>In the absence of the RS there remains uncertainty regarding the extent to which individual authorities would seek to set levels of development which comply with the South East Plan. Within the sub-region, the Dartford Core Strategy was adopted in September 2011 and reflects the South East Plan. Swale is consulting on its Core Strategy, having adopted its Local Plan in 2008 which reflected the emerging South East Plan. The Core Strategies for</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow			Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow			Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow			Yellow			Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow			Light Green	Yellow		<p>Medway and Gravesham are also in draft form.</p> <p>Overall, the scale of development in the sub-region is unlikely to change in the absence of the regional strategy although there may be uncertainty in the short to medium term, in advance of the publication of Local Plans, and the confirmation of strategic policies. The effect of this would be to delay the significant positive benefits to the population and any adverse impacts associated with development. Impacts on biodiversity, soil, air quality, climate and landscape are uncertain in the medium/long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies in the NPPF on quality of design, environmental protection and transport seek to mitigate the effects of continued growth in the sub-region. These are underpinned by legal requirements on local authorities, statutory bodies and others to plan for, and protect, the environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Potential delay in implementation, pending finalisation of individual authority's Local Plans. Consequent uncertainty regarding whether impacts on air, climate and material assets are neutral or negative in the medium term. Location of development (on previously developed land or green field) and hence impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p>

RS Policy KTG2: Economic Growth and Employment

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The main locations for economic growth and employment aspirations are defined. These focus on Ebbsfleet, Medway, Sittingbourne, Sheppey and other major Thameside sites with access to the M25 and national rail. Objectives include: improved economic activity; skills upgrading and the encouragement of higher value activity. These will have a significant positive impact on the population.</p> <p>The development required to ensure this economic growth will have potentially adverse impacts on biodiversity, soil and townscape/landscape. Increased traffic generation would have an adverse impact on air quality and climate. There will be increased use of construction materials and an associated adverse impact on material assets. Increased use of office and industrial space would also cause a potential adverse impact on water resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan on environment, water and climate seek to mitigate the effects of the scale of growth set out for the sub-region.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The Kent Thames Gateway Partnership has been established and comprises regional local authority and private sector representation. Its role is to: attract investment for the delivery of sustainable private sector economic growth; promote public private sector collaboration; work with partners across boundaries to stimulate economic development in the sub-region and facilitate economic growth and investment. It has established 10 economic objectives including for job creation (58,000 by 2026) and new homes (52,000 in the same period). This partnership, together with the South East Local Economic Partnership (LEP) is taking forward setting conditions for economic development in the sub-region.</p> <p>Local authorities are under a duty to co-operate across regional boundaries, and with other organisations including LEPs.</p> <p>In the absence of the RS there remains uncertainty regarding the extent to which individual authorities would seek to set levels of development which comply with the South East Plan. Within the sub-region, the Dartford Core Strategy was adopted in September 2011, reflects the South East Plan and identifies the Ebbsfleet Valley strategic site.</p> <p>Overall, the scale of development in the sub-region is unlikely to change in the absence of the regional strategy although there may be uncertainty in the short to medium term. This is most likely in Medway, Gravesham and Swale where the Core Strategies are in draft/undergoing consultation. The effect of this would be to delay the significant positive benefit to the population and any adverse effects associated with the development.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>NPPF policies for sustainability, sustainable transport, and conserving and enhancing the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Potential delay in implementation, pending finalisation of individual authority's Local Plans.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	White	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	White	White	Consequent uncertainty regarding whether impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, air, climate and landscape are neutral or negative in the medium term.

RS Policy KTG3: Employment Locations

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy defines employment locations including: completion of major employment sites (Dartford, Ebbsfleet, Medway and Sittingbourne/Isle of Sheppey); new employment locations (Medway, Sittingbourne/Sheppey); expansion of technology/knowledge centres (Medway, Sittingbourne); and further education (Medway, Dartford/Ebbsfleet). Medway Towns and Ebbsfleet are identified as transport hubs. The policy also makes provision for alternative sites to be identified in Medway and Swale. This employment and development of learning/skills will have a significant positive impact on the population.</p> <p>The development required to provide this employment will have potentially adverse impacts on biodiversity, soil and townscape/landscape. This is particularly the case in Medway and Sittingbourne which are designated for new employment locations.</p> <p>Increased employment would, potentially, generate increased traffic which would have an adverse impact on air quality and climate. There will be increased use of construction materials connected with development and an associated adverse impact on material assets. Increased use of office and industrial space may also result in an adverse impact on water resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Economic factors influencing growth in the region.</p>
Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	?	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The approach to economic development in this region is being promoted by the South East LEP in conjunction with the Thames Gateway Kent Partnership (TGKP) (see KTG1 and KTG2).</p> <p>Revocation of the RS leads to less planning certainty regarding employment provision, particularly in Medway and Gravesham where local plans pre-date the South East Plan.</p> <p>In view of the role taken by the South East LEP and TKGP in the sub-region it is unlikely that the scale and type of employment locations will change significantly from that envisaged in the RS. However there may be some uncertainty and delay in the short term to medium term as Local Plans are finalised. This would result in delay to the population benefits and a corresponding delay in the realisation of environmental impacts.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures NPPF policies for sustainability, sustainable transport, and conserving and enhancing the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Potential delay in implementation, pending finalisation of individual authority's Local Plans. Consequent uncertainty regarding whether impacts on biodiversity, soil, air, climate and landscape are neutral or negative in the medium term.</p>		

RS Policy KTG4: Amount and Distribution of Housing Development

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy sets out the requirement on local authorities to provide sufficient land to deliver 52,140 additional dwellings in the area, and identifies the targets per authority. The policy includes a 30% target for affordable housing. Local planning authorities are required to work collaboratively. Growth is to be supported by infrastructure, employment, environmental improvement and community services.</p> <p>The provision of greater housing, including a significant proportion of affordable housing, will have a significant beneficial impact on the population. Major regeneration sites in the region require reclamation which would provide an overall benefit to soils and could also be of benefit to townscape.</p> <p>The construction required to produce this level of additional housing will require some use of green field sites. This 'land take' will have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soils and landscape. The net effect on soils, given substantial regeneration in the area, is considered to be neutral whereas the impact on biodiversity and landscape is likely to be minor negative. Increased private transport would have an adverse impact on air quality which would also impact adversely on climate. Use of construction materials will deplete material assets. The increased population will have a significant negative impact on water supply.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Environmental improvement required by the policy. Policies throughout the plan relating to</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Economic factors influencing growth in the region.</p>
Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	+	-	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	0	0	0	0	?	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for more houses within the sub-region. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities in order to achieve this objective.</p> <p>Revocation removes the targets for affordable housing; however, the NPPF requires that Local Plans meet ‘the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area’ (para 47). The NPPF also seeks to deliver a ‘wide choice of high quality homes and to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends... and the needs of different groups in the community such as older people’ (para. 50). Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it may have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur, subject to the status of local plans in the sub-region.</p> <p>The approach to economic development in this region is being promoted by the South East LEP in conjunction with the Thames Gateway Kent Partnership (see KTG1 and KTG2). The target for new homes set by TGKP mirrors the RS (52,000). Local authorities have a duty to co-operate across boundaries and therefore strategic objectives for housing and transport should be met.</p> <p>The overall target for housing in the sub-region remains the same as the RS but local authorities will set their own housing targets. These are likely to be informed by the South East Plan in Dartford which has recently adopted its Core Strategy. The extent to which this</p>		

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Yellow	White	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	White	Light Green	White	White	White	White	White	White	Yellow	White	White	White	White	White	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	White	White	White	<p>will be the case in Swale, Medway and Gravesham is less certain. Therefore there will remain an overall benefit to the population but some uncertainty regarding the locations for development and hence potential delay in implementation.</p> <p>There is a predicted delay in the significant benefits to the population, with a corresponding delay in the realisation of associated environmental impacts. These are uncertain in the medium term for biodiversity, soil, water, air, climate, material assets and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>NPPF policies for sustainability, sustainable transport, and conserving and enhancing the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Potential delay in implementation, pending finalisation of individual authority's Local Plans. Consequent uncertainty regarding whether impacts on biodiversity, soil, air, climate, material assets and landscape are neutral or negative in the medium term and uncertainty regarding significance of negative impact on water.</p>

RS Policy KTG5: The Role of the Retail Centres

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary					
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L						
Retention	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy provides for further development of Dartford, Gravesend, Sittingbourne and Chatham as major town centres comprising mixed retail, leisure and service use. In addition ancillary retail and service space is to be provided at Ebbsfleet. These proposals will have a positive impact on the economy and population.</p> <p>The policy states that Bluewater will maintain its role as an out of centre regional shopping centre. Any proposals for additional floorspace would be considered through a review of the RS, and any such proposals would require improved access by non-car modes.</p> <p>Other local and district facilities are to be determined locally.</p> <p>Development in the identified town centres will require construction materials which will have an adverse impact on material assets. Concentration of the development in towns should not impact on biodiversity, soil or landscape. There may be a positive impact on townscape, although this is uncertain as it will depend on the details of the development, Increased retail will generate additional air emissions which would have an adverse impact on climatic factors.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Impacts on transport, air quality and climate will be mitigated by implementation of transport policies (e.g. SH7)</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Effect on townscape which will depend on the details of town centre development.</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	0	+	+	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Removal of the RS policy removes the plan requirement that proposals for future additional floor space at Bluewater would be subject to RS review and such proposals accompanied by improved access to the centre by non-car modes. This increases the prospect that, subject to commercial decisions, an early decision could be made to expand Bluewater. If this was to occur there would be additional land take which could have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soils and landscape.</p> <p>The duty to co-operate, together with the NPPF policy framework, means that local authorities should continue to ensure that local transport policies are mutually consistent and deliver sustainable and effective development.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The potential early development of proposals for extension to Bluewater.</p>

RS Policy KTG6: Flood Risk

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>In order to accommodate growth, this policy requires co-ordinated measures for flood protection and surface water drainage associated with the Rivers Thames, Medway and Swale. Strategic Flood Risk Assessments are to be updated and local assessments undertaken for major sites. This will have a significant beneficial effect on population and human health and water control. Green space outside urban areas may provide opportunities for flood storage and this could provide opportunity for benefit to biodiversity and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF provides policies to protect against climate change, flooding and coastal change (section10). It requires local authorities to undertake Strategic Flood Risk Assessments in support of Local Plans, and to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding (Paragraph 100).</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>The Environment Agency is a statutory consultee in the development control process, providing advice to local authorities regarding the risk associated with development in the flood plain. Under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 the lead local flood authority for an area is the unitary authority or the county council. These, together with district councils, internal drainage boards, highways authorities, water companies and the Environment Agency are risk management authorities. The Act requires the lead local flood authority to develop, maintain, apply and monitor a strategy for local flood risk management in the area. The lead local flood authority will also be responsible for ensuring the strategy is put in place, but will need to work in co-operation with local partners.</p> <p>A similar level of protection to flooding is provided by the NPPF policies in combination with the requirements of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.</p> <p>With respect to the potential generation of significant improvements to biodiversity and landscape, this is not explicit in the NPPF but is implicit in policies relating to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment (section 11). Paragraph 118 encourages local planning authorities, <i>inter alia</i>, to take opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures N/A</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty None</p>

RS Policy KTG7: Green Initiatives

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy reflects the intention to invest in the Thames Gateway Parklands as a basis for successful regeneration of the sub-region. This policy requires that development, management and use of the countryside, urban green spaces and areas requiring flood management should be co-ordinated by the responsible organisations.</p> <p>The provision of access and recreation will provide benefit to the population and human health. The proposed measures for enhancement of landscape, habitats and heritage will have a positive impact on biodiversity, cultural heritage and landscape. Flood management will have a beneficial impact on water resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Funding allocation</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Development of the Thames Gateway Parklands is being taken forward by Greening the Gateway Kent and Medway, a partnership of public, private and third sector organisations. Recent initiatives include an application for Government funding for a new Local Nature Partnership.</p> <p>Paragraph 114 of the NPPF provides the same policy approach as the regional strategy to the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of green infrastructure. However, paragraph 117 of the goes further stating that planning policies should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries; • identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation; • promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan; • aim to prevent harm to geological conservation interests; and • where Nature Improvement Areas are identified in Local Plans, consider specifying the types of development that may be appropriate in these Areas. <p>The plan policies are supported by the development management requirements set out in paragraph 118.</p> <p>Paragraph 99 of the NPPF notes that planning for green infrastructure can be a suitable adaptation measure to managing risks, including flood risks, arising when new development is brought forward in areas vulnerable to climate change impacts.</p> <p>In addition, the introduction of Local Nature Partnerships announced in the Natural Environment White Paper which will complement existing local partnerships which deal with matters such as provision of green infrastructure will improve the chances of the delivery of</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>the policy. Such partnerships will be able to work across administrative boundaries in order to enable planning of networks at the scale that has the most impact.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None</p> <p>Assumptions It is assumed that local authorities will work together making use of the duty to cooperate and the local nature partnerships to optimise the benefits of green infrastructure.</p> <p>Uncertainty As with retention of the policy.</p>

RS Policy LF1: Core Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy sets out the core strategy which seeks to support sustainable economic growth by meeting development needs in urban areas while protecting the broad extent of the Metropolitan Green Belt. Housing demand is to be met from existing urban areas with small reviews of Municipal Green Belt for urban extension where required. The total number of new jobs is estimated to be 39,500 between 2006 and 2016 (LF 2) and the total housing provision for the sub-region (2006-2026) is 47,800 dwellings (LF 3). The economic growth arising from this policy will have a significant positive impact on the population. There will also be benefit to the population from the provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>Concentration of development in existing areas will have the benefit of minimising adverse impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape. Policy measures to enhance biodiversity and the quality of the built environment, together with the character of natural and cultural resources will have a positive impact on biodiversity, cultural heritage and landscape.</p> <p>Development involving new construction will have an adverse impact on mineral resources and material assets. Greater demand for water resources in urban areas will have a potentially significant adverse impact on water, and may prejudice water quality.</p> <p>Additional development is also likely to generate greater traffic emissions which will have a negative impact on air quality and climate.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
																											<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty None</p>	
Revocation	0	?	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	+	0	?	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Of the eleven local authorities which are partly or entirely located within the sub-region, seven have adopted Core Strategies which either post date the South East Plan or are based on the emerging South East Plan (Spelthorne (Feb. 2009); Elmbridge (July 2011); Epsom and Ewell (July 2007); Sevenoaks (Feb 2011); Tandridge (Oct. 2008); Mole Valley (Oct. 2009) and Surrey Heath (2012). Core strategies for the remaining authorities are in draft (Reigate and Banstead; Woking) or delayed (Guildford; Runnymede).</p> <p>The majority of authorities are proposing economic development in line with the South East Plan (see LF 2) but there remains uncertainty regarding the extent of housing provision to be delivered in the districts for those authorities which have not published Core Strategies (see LF 3). The overall effect is likely to be a delay in the positive benefits to the population associated with new housing development in particular, and a delay in the associated adverse impacts on environmental receptors, pending adoption of Local Plans.</p> <p>The policies of the NPPF seek to protect the Green Belt (section 9), and to enhance its beneficial use including for sport and recreation, retention and enhancement of landscape, visual amenity and biodiversity (para. 81). This, in combination with other policies relating to good design (section 7) provides a basis for enhancement of biodiversity, cultural heritage and townscape provided that the development does not entail significant land take.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	White	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Light Orange	Light Orange	Light Orange	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	Light Green	Yellow	White	Light Green	<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Approach taken by individual local authorities. Extent to which growth involves use of green field land.</p>

RS Policy LF2: Economic Development

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy states that employment-related development will take place primarily on land already in employment use or available for use. Local authorities are to work with neighbouring authorities, for example in south and west London, to provide employment land. Some new land may be permitted for development (policies LF5 and LF6). Strategic employment land is to be identified and mixed use development encouraged. Residential development may be permitted on non-strategic employment land provided there are environmental and amenity gains.</p> <p>The balanced provision of employment related development will have a significant positive impact on the population. Focusing this development on existing sites should cause minimal impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape. There is unlikely to be an impact on cultural heritage.</p> <p>Increased employment is likely to generate greater traffic movement, which may have a negative impact on air quality and climate. The use of construction materials in new development will have an adverse impact on material assets.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The policy clearly focuses new development into existing areas and requires local planning authorities to work with neighbouring authorities to identify employment land. Under the NPPF authorities have a duty to co-operate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries. However, the extent to which individual authorities in the sub-region would focus on existing urban areas is uncertain.</p> <p>Of the eleven local authorities which are partly or entirely included within the sub-region, seven have adopted Core Strategies which either post date the South East Plan, or are based on the emerging South East Plan (Spelthorne (Feb 2009); Elmbridge (July 2011); Epsom and Ewell (July 2007); Sevenoaks (Feb 2011); Tandridge (Oct 2008); Mole Valley (Oct 2009) and Surrey Heath (Feb 2012). The latter was adopted by the council in the knowledge that the RS would be revoked, but the evidence base for the South East Plan was considered to remain relevant.</p> <p>Core Strategies for the remaining authorities are in draft (Reigate and Banstead, Woking) or delayed (Guildford, Runnymede).</p> <p>The majority of the authorities propose economic development in line with the South East Plan although there is some residual uncertainty regarding the approach which will be taken by the other districts. Overall it is considered probable that employment related land allocations would, under the NPPF, be subject to similar policy provisions to those contained within the RS.</p> <p>The positive and negative impacts identified with retention of the policy would also be anticipated following revocation.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>NPPF policies relating to sustainable development and re-use of land.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Approach to be taken by individual local authorities. Consequent environmental impacts if employment allocated outside existing areas.</p>

RS Policy LF3: Broad Mount and Distribution of Future Housing Development

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy sets a target of 47,880 additional dwellings in the London Fringe between 2006 and 2026., and defines the expected delivery from each district. The original target provision for Guildford (7,940 dwellings in the plan period) was struck out, following a High Court challenge. Delivery of these dwellings will have a significant positive impact on population and human health. The use of minerals for construction will have an adverse impact on material assets.</p> <p>The phasing of housing delivery within the vicinity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA will mitigate against adverse impacts on biodiversity (policy NRM6).</p> <p>An increase in the number of dwellings will have a significant adverse impact on water resources and may impact on the capability of sewage treatment facilities. There are existing functional issues with the Hogsmill SWT which serves Epsom & Ewell and Elmbridge. The policy requires local development frameworks to reflect further work needed to resolve the issue.</p> <p>There will be additional traffic generated from the dwellings and this will have a negative impact on air quality and climate.</p> <p>Selective review of the Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) to accommodate sustainable urban extensions, could result in additional 'land take' for development and will have an adverse impact on biodiversity and soils. Subject to design, new development could have a positive impact on townscape, but development in MGB is likely to have an adverse impact on landscape. The net impact on the townscape/landscape aspect is unclear and could range</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>from minor positive to minor negative.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions Economic conditions consistent with residential development</p> <p>Uncertainty The style and location of development, and consequential net impact on townscape/landscape.</p>
Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for more houses within the sub-region. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities in order to achieve this objective. Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it will have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur, dependent on the status of local plans</p> <p>Planning authorities have a duty to co-operate and NPPF policies relating to planning strategically across boundaries (paras. 156 and 178-181) will mean that local authorities should continue to ensure that land use and local transport policies are mutually consistent, and deliver sustainable and effective development.</p> <p>Of the districts included in the sub-region housing allocation, Guildford, Mole Valley, Reigate and Banstead, Sevenoaks and Tandridge are partly included within the sub-region. Removal of the sub-region boundary will simplify the planning policy context for housing provision and permit these districts to consider housing requirement according to need, as far as consistent with NPPF policies.</p> <p>Revocation of the policy means that Local Plans do not have to conform to the RS, and</p>			

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>provision of housing allocation may differ from the South East Plan. In addition the Local Plans do not have to conform to the RS in terms of selective review of the Green Belt to accommodate sustainable urban extensions at Guildford and Woking, together with 2,500 homes at the former DERA site, Chertsey. In light of its recent legal challenge against the South East Plan, Guildford has not set housing numbers.</p> <p>While seven of the eleven authorities have adopted Core Strategies which comply with the RS targets, there remains uncertainty regarding the location of sites in the other authorities which account for over 50% of the housing allocation. This uncertainty may deter potential developers and may delay housing provision. The effect of this would be to delay the significant positive benefit to the population, and any adverse impacts associated with development.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The style and location of development, and consequential net impact on townscape/landscape.</p>

RS Policy LF4: Affordable Housing

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy provides a target of 40% affordable new housing in the sub-region. Provision to be made on all sites, with commuted payments if not feasible. It is envisaged that supply in the region will come principally from brown field sites in urban areas.</p> <p>Provision of this level of affordable housing would have a significant positive impact on population and human health.</p> <p>The policy could potentially help to reduce the need to travel if the delivery of affordable housing means that people are located closer to the work place. The impact on air quality and climate is uncertain. The quality of the developments will govern whether there is a positive impact on townscape and landscape and the impact is assessed as uncertain.</p> <p>The level of water consumption is likely to increase due to increased development which is likely to have an adverse impact on water supply.</p> <p>Regeneration of brown field sites is likely to have a positive impact on soil quality. Provided the development is focused on re-use of land there should be a neutral impact on biodiversity.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>In the short term, because of factors such as the economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less in the short term. Impacts on air quality and climate will be dependent on proximity to the workplace. The impact on townscape will be related to the quality of design.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	?	+	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for more affordable houses within the sub-region and the revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it may have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur, subject to the status of local plans.</p> <p>Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing and states that local authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their local plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for affordable housing. This is expected to have the same significant benefits to the population and human health as retention of the policy, although there could be some uncertainty in the short to medium term for those local authorities without an up to date plan. The presumption in favour of sustainable development may act to lessen this uncertainty.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>In the short to medium term, because of factors such as the economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy, and therefore the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															scale of the impacts will be less.

RS Policy LF5: Urban Areas and Regional Hubs

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy sets out that development is to be focused on existing built-up areas. This will reduce potential impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape in rural areas. Within urban areas the focus is to safeguard existing open land which will assist in protection of biodiversity and soil.</p> <p>The provision of development, including housing, within the regional hubs will contribute significantly to the economic development of the sub-region, thereby having a significant positive impact on population.</p> <p>High design standards are required and this will have a positive impact on townscape.</p> <p>Guildford, Redhill/Reigate and Woking are identified as regional hubs, with investment in infrastructure required, and improved transport management which would, potentially, maintain or reduce aerial emissions from traffic. The net effect across the sub-region is uncertain.</p> <p>Some expansion into MGB is predicted by the policy (Woking and Redhill/Reigate) although this would follow a boundary review tested through the Local Development Document (LDD) process.</p> <p>Expansion into MGB, if it occurs, would have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape. However this would be subject to review, occur later in the plan period, and be of local rather than regional significance. The impact on these receptors is uncertain.</p> <p>In view of the high design standards, combined with the potential loss of MGB, the landscape</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>aspect is scored uncertain for landscape and positive for townscape.</p> <p>Greater housing development will have a negative impact on material assets through the use of construction materials and energy and an increased generation of waste. There are also potential adverse effects on water resources in the sub-region in the medium to long term given the proposed scale of development and existing pressure on water supply.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan on environment, water, flood protection and transport seek to mitigate the effects of growth set out for the sub-region. The policy requires high design standards and improved traffic management around the regional hubs.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Development proceeds according to the plan.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The net effect of improved traffic management on air quality and climate. In the longer term the impact of MGB review on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p>
Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will leave decisions to local authorities, collaborating under the duty to co-operate, to bring forward the necessary development across the sub-region in line with the policies in the NPPF. The local plans covering two of the regional hubs (Guildford and Reigate) pre-date by several years the adoption of the RS, and the Woking Core Strategy is in draft form.</p> <p>Guildford successfully challenged its initial housing allocation in the Plan, but overall housing numbers in the Plan remain. Therefore a similar scale of housing is anticipated following revocation of the RS. The NPPF provides protection to Green Belt land (section 9), requires good design (section 7) and promotes sustainable transport (section 4). The extent to which sustainable transport will offset greater use of personal transport associated with economic</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>growth is uncertain. Good urban design will have a positive impact on townscape and the impact on biodiversity and landscape in the long term would be uncertain.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions It is assumed that following revocation of the RS, the high court challenge would lapse.</p> <p>Uncertainty Impact of sustainable transport on air quality and climate. Extent, if any, of Green Belt review and development.</p>

RS Policy LF6: Development at Former DERA Site, Chertsey

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary				
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L					
Retention	0	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy is for a large-scale mixed-use development on the former DERA site at Chertsey to provide 2,500 homes in order to meet regional needs. The scale and mix of the development is to be determined taking into account need to protect the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and other European sites. Development requires a review of the Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB) and, if the development does not proceed, there would be no requirement to find to an alternative location.</p> <p>The requirement for detailed examination, including review of MGB, means that development would be achieved in the medium to long term, rather than near future.</p> <p>Provision of a development on the scale envisaged would have a significant positive impact on economic growth and population in the region.</p> <p>Formerly the site was acquired by the Government during the war and has been used as a military vehicle experimental establishment and MOD research base. Remediation of potential ground contamination to facilitate development would have a positive impact on soil quality.</p> <p>Development would generate additional traffic which would have an adverse impact on air quality and climate. Locally there are existing significant air quality problems and the policy requires that development does not breach national and European air quality standards. Subject to this the air quality and climate impacts are considered to be neutral.</p> <p>The proximity of development could have an adverse impact on the Thames Basin SPA. However, the development mix is required to take appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures to protect the SPA and other relevant European sites. Provided this is achieved the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>impact on biodiversity would be neutral.</p> <p>There would be loss of greenbelt and a potential adverse impact on landscape and biodiversity. There may also be an adverse impact on soil, but it is probable that this would be offset by the positive impact of soil remediation and consequently the residual impact on soil is considered to be neutral.</p> <p>Greater housing development will have a negative impact on material assets through the use of construction materials and energy and an increased generation of waste. There is also a potential minor adverse effect on water supply in the sub-region in the long term given the proposed scale of development and existing pressure on water supply in the region.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Statutory protection afforded to air quality and to wildlife sites of national and European significance. Measures undertaken to reduce water loss and water usage (e.g. metering).</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Development proceeds in the medium term and achieves the policy objectives of protecting European sites of wildlife significance, and ensuring compliance with national and European air quality standards.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Whether development of the site proceeds, together with scale and timing; all of which would be determined following Green Belt review, and in line with the objectives for protection of wildlife and air quality. The prospect of development appears more likely following a decision taken by Runnymede Borough Council's planning committee in February 2012 to explore the release of the 129 hectare DERA site from green belt status in order to allow between 1,500 - 2,500 houses to be built.</p>
Revocation	0	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will leave decisions to local authorities, collaborating under the duty to co-operate, to bring forward the necessary development across the sub-region in line with</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>the policies in the NPPF.</p> <p>The Core Strategy for Runnymede is in preparation with a consultation period scheduled for early 2013. However the recent decision by the planning committee to review the green belt status of the DERA site for residential development (see above) indicates that the council is generally supportive of the initiative. Mixed development comprising office space, cafe/restaurant facilities, childcare facilities and parking, located to the north of the DERA site, has already been approved by Runnymede Borough Council and neighbouring Surrey Heath Borough Council (2011) and the developers (Crest Nicholson and Avia Investors) intend to submit a revised planning application which would include 200 (additional) homes.</p> <p>The prospect that the residential development will proceed appears to be unaffected by revocation of the RS, and remains subject to green belt review. The scale is likely to be similar and therefore the impacts are unchanged from those associated with the RS policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Existing statutory protection afforded to sites of national and international significance for wildlife. Existing national air quality standards. Measures undertaken to reduce water loss and water usage (e.g. metering).</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Development does proceed on a similar scale to that envisaged under assessment of the RS</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As above</p>

RS Policy LF7: Town Centres

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy establishes the principle of towns and district centres providing the focus for retail, employment, built leisure and community facilities. The investment in development, infrastructure and services is centred on Guildford, Redhill and Woking, and to a lesser extent on Epsom, Sevenoaks and Staines.</p> <p>Expansion of employment and leisure in these centres will have a significant positive impact on economic development and population. The enhancement of leisure and community facilities will also benefit human health.</p> <p>The policy encourages mixed use development with employment and housing, the intention being to reduce long distance travel. While the development proposed will require access and potentially greater transport, location of workers in closer proximity to jobs could reduce this need. The impact on air quality and climate would be neutral.</p> <p>Greater housing development will have a negative impact on material assets through the use of construction materials and energy and an increased generation of waste. There are also potential adverse effects on water resources in the sub-region in the medium to long term given the proposed scale of development and existing pressure on water supply.</p> <p>The policy requires good design for development which will have a positive impact on townscape.</p> <p>Concentration of development into urban areas should protect biodiversity and soil although there may be a small negative effect on biodiversity in urban areas. For the purpose of this assessment the potential effect on urban biodiversity is considered to be insignificant.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>For the purpose of this assessment the potential effect on urban biodiversity is considered to be insignificant. Provision of housing in mixed use development offsets other increases in transport resulting from the development.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will leave decisions to local authorities, collaborating under the duty to co-operate, to bring forward the necessary development across the sub-region in line with the policies in the NPPF.</p> <p>Of the published local plans covering the six settlements named in the policy, three have been adopted and informed by the RS or the emerging South East Plan (Spelthorne, Epsom and Ewell; and Sevenoaks) are dated 2009. Guilford's Town Centre Draft is in consultation form and due to be published later in 2012.</p> <p>The principle of town centre regeneration is supported by the NPPF (section 2) which requires the definition of a <i>network and hierarchy of centres that is resilient to anticipated future economic changes</i> (paragraph 23) and also requires the allocation of sites for mixed development (retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community and residential).</p> <p>Other NPPF policies promote sustainable transport (section 4) and good design (section 7).</p> <p>It is concluded that the revocation of policy LF7 is likely to lead to similar environmental effects as its retention.</p>	

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty None.</p>

RS Policy LF8: Sub-Regional Transport Hubs and Spokes

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy to develop a network of sub-regional spokes linking sub-regional hubs within local transport plans will encourage integrated use of public transport within the sub-regions and connecting with the regional centres. This will reduce transport emissions leading to improved air quality and climate impacts.</p> <p>There may be construction associated with infrastructure linking sub-regional hubs. This would have potential adverse impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape. The scale of such impacts is uncertain and related to development needs.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Extent of construction related to infrastructure, and associated impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF promotes sustainable transport (section 4) with encouragement to solutions which reduce both greenhouse gas emissions and congestion. Local plans are to support</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>development which, where reasonable, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. In view of the policy context of the NPPF it is concluded that similar benefits to air quality and climate will be achieved.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Timescale for implementation of NPPF policies. Extent of infrastructure provision and associated impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p>

RS Policy LF9: Green Belt Management

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy promotes specific initiatives to manage Green Belt countryside as a multifunctional resource including measures for positive enhancement of landscape and conservation of Green Belt at the rural-urban fringe. Specific support is provided to the Green Arc (South West) initiative to enhance Metropolitan Green Belt (MGB), and to management plans for the AONBs (Surrey Hills, Kent Downs and High Weald).</p> <p>This policy will have a positive impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape. The integration of recreation into multi-functional plans for MGB will enhance opportunities for recreation which will have a positive impact on human health. Although not explicitly expressed, the multi-functional resource aspect of the policy would provide opportunity to provide flood storage capacity which would have a positive impact on water.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Section 9 of the NPPF sets out policies relating to Green Belt. Local authorities are required to plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt including: looking for opportunities for access, outdoor sport and recreation; the retention and enhancement of landscape, visual amenity and biodiversity, and the improvement of derelict land (paragraph 81).</p> <p>In addition local planning authorities are required to give '<i>great weight</i>' to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (paragraph 115).</p> <p>The focus on the 'multifunctional' beneficial use of Green Belt, together with protection given to designated sites (including AONBs) mirror the objectives of the RS policy and similar beneficial impacts are predicted.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures N/A</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty None</p>

RS Policy LF10: Small Scale Site Tariff

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	0	-	?	0	+	+	0	-	?	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy establishes the mechanism for obtaining contributions from new development to support delivery of infrastructure and services within the sub-region aimed at mitigating the impact of cumulative development. Provision of this infrastructure will potentially benefit the population. In addition, by integration of more efficient public transport, there is likely to be a positive effect on air quality and climate.</p> <p>Dependent on the scale of the infrastructure there may be negative impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape. These would be short term impacts during construction for underground infrastructure, but could be long term for above ground structures. Use of construction materials would also have an adverse impact on material assets. The scale of any impacts associated with development is uncertain.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the RS relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Water infrastructure not funded by levy.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Extent of infrastructure, timing and location (above or below ground) and resulting impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	0	-	?	0	+	+	0	-	?	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was introduced on 6th April 2011 and enables local authorities to levy a charge on new developments to fund infrastructure requirements of the local authority, community and neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The CIL will have similar impacts to the RS policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Water infrastructure not funded by levy.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Extent of infrastructure, timing and location (above or below ground) and resulting impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p>

RS Policy WCBV1: CORE STRATEGY

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	-	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy states that local authorities will provide for development and infrastructure to sustain the economic growth of the sub-region. Regional and sub-regional hubs will be the main focus for transport investment and development in the sub-region. Regional hubs are identified as: Basingstoke, High Wycombe, Reading and Slough. A second tier of sub-regional hubs comprises: Bracknell, Maidenhead and Newbury. To the extent that development cannot be satisfactorily accommodated in the existing built-up areas, sustainable urban extensions will be promoted at selected settlements. Sustainable greenfield allocations should be mainly focused on the periphery of those hubs where other constraints do not prevent this – Basingstoke, Reading, Bracknell and Newbury. These urban extensions should minimise incursions into Green Belt or protected environmental areas.</p> <p>The policy seeks to create an additional 79,300 jobs (by 2016), 102,100 net additional dwellings (by 2026) and to achieve a better balance between the location and growth of jobs and homes while protecting the area’s environmental assets, including the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment opportunities and housing; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on large urban extensions on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material assets, increased commuting along the</p>		

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>principal road networks leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment. In addition, there are statutory duties on organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies (in this case Thames Water) to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	-	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for growth in the sub-region given that the sub-region contains some of the most deprived wards in the South East, although the sub-region has significant potential related in part to its proximity to London and Heathrow and strong connectivity. The South East Plan Panel report acknowledged (paragraph 21.18) that this sub-region had a fast growing economy and that the penalties for under provision of housing seem to pose greater risks to the local and region economy than the additional impact of additional housing on infrastructure and the environment (paragraph 21.56). In that context it is more likely that more housing will be delivered in these areas. However, as the Panel report acknowledged at the time there was solidarity among the relevant local authorities in resisting higher housing provision (paragraph 21.57).</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>opportunities and housing; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on large urban extensions on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material assets, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate).</p> <p>The Thames Valley Berkshire and Enterprise M3 Local Economic Partnerships (LEPs) are taking forward setting the conditions for economic development in the sub-region.</p> <p>This along with the duty to cooperate, NPPF policies relating to planning strategically across local boundaries (paragraphs 156 and 178-181) will mean that local authorities should continue to ensure that land use policies are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their area.</p> <p>Growth is focused on four regional hubs: Basingstoke, High Wycombe, Reading and Slough with specific reference to the potential to provide for sustainable urban extensions. The status of local planning documents in each case is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basingstoke: The council has received a Judgement from the High Court, in the case of the Manydown Company Limited v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council which requires the council, within a reasonable timeframe to reconsider the form of the pre submission strategy in relation to the proposed allocated sites and locations for development. The decisions previously made by the council's Cabinet on 23 January 2012 to re-affirm the council's position in respect of the proposed allocated sites and locations for inclusion in the core strategy and to approve the pre-submission Core Strategy for consultation have been quashed by the Court. • High Wycombe: the Core Strategy was adopted on 7 July 2008 and policy CS2 reiterates that the principal focus for new development will be High Wycombe (including the adjoining settlements of Downley, Hazlemere/ Widmer End/Tylers Green, Loudwater and Wooburn Green). Of the 8,050 homes required, the Core Strategy identifies that 7,240 will be in and around High Wycombe. • Reading: the Core Strategy was adopted in January 2008. In its spatial planning principles, development should be located in areas of high accessibility where it does

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>least harm to the environment and delivers most benefits to the wider community. Under Policy CS14, the Council will be required to provide a total of 5720 dwellings in the period 2006-2016 and 5210 dwellings in the subsequent period 2016-2026. The Core Strategy concludes that 'virtually all development proposed under the Strategy is brownfield land. The only exception is the proposed development of Green Park. The strategy does not envisage the need to allocate any other greenfield land.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slough: the Core Strategy was adopted in December 2008. The spatial strategy seeks to direct development to Slough town centre since this is the most accessible and seeks to optimise the collocation of employment, shopping, leisure, transport and other facilities. The Spatial Strategy also means that there is no need to build on any land outside of the urban area. <p>The three adopted Core Strategies indicate an allocation and location of growth consistent with the RS policy; however, there is a preference to locate growth within the existing urban area and on brownfield land which has minimised the negative effects associated with the development. However, the current uncertainties over the Basingstoke site allocation in the draft Core Strategy mean that revocation of the South East Plan policy is likely to result in some uncertainty in the short and medium term until policies have been adopted. This potentially will lead to delays in delivering development in these broad locations in the interim period.</p> <p>Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of housing delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Yellow	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Orange	Orange	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	<p>and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of development and housing is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy WCBV2: EMPLOYMENT LAND

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy requires that local development documents give priority to the retention of existing employment land in employment use in order that the need for additional new employment floor space will, to the extent possible, be met through the more efficient use of employment land in town centres and established employment areas. The policy promotes joint working with neighbouring authorities having regard to evidence, the broad balance between labour supply and demand, the suitability of existing employment land and availability.</p> <p>The policy looked to create an additional 79,300 jobs (by 2016). No strategic employment sites are identified although the need for land around Basingstoke and Reading are referenced.</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material assets, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the development provision on the environment. In addition, there statutory duties on organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies (in this case Thames Water) to plan for and licence the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for employment opportunities within the sub-region.</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment opportunities and housing; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on large urban extensions on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material assets, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate).</p> <p>The Thames Valley Berkshire and Enterprise M3 Local Economic Partnerships (LEPs) are taking forward setting the conditions for economic development in the sub-region.</p> <p>This along with the duty to cooperate, NPPF policies relating to planning strategically across local boundaries (paragraphs 156 and 178-181) will mean that local authorities should continue to ensure that land use policies are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their area.</p> <p>Growth is focused on four regional hubs: Basingstoke, High Wycombe, Reading and Slough The status of local planning documents in each case is as follows:</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basingstoke – High Court ruling has required Council to reconsider development provision and to bring forward a new Core Strategy. High Wycombe: the Core Strategy focuses development for business on regeneration and intensification. Land for business of various types currently extends to around 325ha across the District with over 60% is in the urban area. The Core Strategy indicates that the increasing trend towards higher job densities means that there is scope to release some employment land, particularly where its economic potential is more limited or where wider regeneration objectives can be realised. Reading: Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy states that all major office development should take place in the centre or in the A33 corridor. All major industrial and warehousing development should take place in Core Employment Areas or in the A33 corridor. The site of the former Reading stadium and waste facilities at Southside is identified as suitable for employment development which builds on the improvements in accessibility planned for this corridor. Slough: Core Policy 5 of the Core Strategy directs that the most intensive employment-generating uses will be located in the town centre or may also be located on the Slough Trading Estate. <p>There are significant benefits on population from the creation of employment opportunities and improved connectivity. The benefits of this policy are maintained by the LEP, in conjunction with LPAs and there is a clear preference in the adopted strategies to locate growth within the existing urban area and on brownfield land which will minimise the negative effects associated with the development on greenfield sites. However, the current uncertainties over the Basingstoke Core Strategy mean that revocation of the South East Plan policy is likely to result in some uncertainty in the short and medium term until policies have been adopted. This potentially will lead to delays in delivering development in these broad locations in the interim period.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Yellow	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	<p>case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects are likely to be less in the short and medium term.</p>

RS Policy WCBV3: SCALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy requires the planning authorities will allocate sufficient land and facilitate the delivery of 102,100 net additional dwellings in the Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley sub-region between 2006 and 2026. This is split between the named authorities (Basingstoke & Deane, Bracknell Forest, Guildford, Hart, Reading, Rushmoor, Slough, South Bucks, Surrey Heath, West Berkshire, Windsor & Maidenhead, Wokingham and Wycombe).</p> <p>The policy also requires that the local authorities should consider the phasing of housing delivery within the vicinity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The Thames Basin Heaths is home to internationally important ground nesting birds such as the Nightjar, Dartford Warbler and Woodlarks. The Heaths extend from the Thames Basin lowlands, across North Hampshire through South East Beckshire and Marlborough Downs. In 2005, it was designated as a special protection area (SPA), a designation (classification) used under the Birds' Directive to protect wild birds and their habitats. The Ash to Brookwood Heaths in the Thames basin is a special site of scientific interest (SSCI) basin and is also classified as a special area of conservation (SAC) under the Habitats Directive because of its rare plant species. The policy ensures that appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures are secured in advance of development being occupied and that LPAs should work with the regional planning body and Natural England to monitor housing delivery in their area against the provision of avoidance and mitigation measures.</p> <p>The increased provision of housing is likely to lead to significant positive effects on the population and human health in the medium to long term. However, this will also depend on related factors such as the quality of the houses, their density, location relative to green</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	<p>spaces and ambient air quality. The overall impact on townscape/landscape is uncertain.</p> <p>The demand for construction materials and energy is likely to increase, as is traffic in the region, while the amount of waste generated is also likely to increase. These are likely to have negative on material assets, air quality and climatic factors. The provision of additional housing will have a negative impact on water resources.</p> <p>The effects on biodiversity are negative; however, the commitment in the policy to phase development and for NE to monitor and review the effects is critical to avoidance of damage to a European designated site.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>			
Revocation	0	-	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for growth in the sub-region given that the sub-region contains some of the most deprived wards in the South East, although the sub-region has significant potential related in part to its proximity to London and Heathrow and strong connectivity. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities in order to achieve this objective. Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Orange	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Orange	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	<p>impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however it will have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur; dependent on the status of local plans.</p> <p>The South East Plan Panel report acknowledged (paragraph 21.18) that this sub-region had a fast growing economy and that the penalties for under provision of housing seem to pose greater risks to the local and region economy than the additional impact of additional housing on infrastructure and the environment (paragraph 21.56). In that context is more likely that more housing will be delivered in these areas. However, as the Panel report acknowledged at the time there was solidarity among the relevant local authorities in resisting higher housing provision (paragraph 21.57).</p> <p>Paragraph 159 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should prepare Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries.</p> <p>Growth is focused on four regional hubs: Basingstoke, High Wycombe, Reading and Slough with specific reference to the potential to provide for sustainable urban extensions. The status of local planning documents in each case are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basingstoke: High Court ruling has required Council to reconsider development provision and to bring forward a new Core Strategy. • High Wycombe: Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy (adopted 2008) reiterates that the principal focus for new development will be High Wycombe (including the adjoining settlements of Downley, Hazlemere/ Widmer End/Tylers Green, Loudwater and Wooburn Green). Of the 8,050 homes required, the Core Strategy identifies that 7,240 will be in and around High Wycombe. • Reading: Under Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy (adopted 2008), the Council will be required to provide a total of 5720 dwellings in the period 2006-2016 and 5210 dwellings in the subsequent period 2016-2026. The Core Strategy concludes that 'virtually all development proposed under the Strategy is brownfield land. The only exception is the proposed development of Green Park. The strategy does not envisage the need to

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Orange	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	White	White	White	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	<p><i>allocate any other greenfield land.'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slough: the Core Strategy was adopted in December 2008. The spatial strategy seeks to direct development to Slough town centre since this is the most accessible and seeks to optimise the collocation of employment, shopping, leisure, transport and other facilities. The Spatial Strategy also means that there is no need to build on any land outside of the urban area. <p>The three adopted Core Strategies indicate an allocation and location of growth consistent with the Core Strategy; however, there is a preference to locate growth within the existing urban area and on brownfield land which has minimised the negative effects associated with the development. However, the current uncertainties over the Basingstoke Core Strategy mean that revocation of the South East Plan policy is likely to result in some uncertainty in the short and medium term until policies have been adopted. This potentially will lead to delays in delivering development in these broad locations in the interim period.</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the provision of housing but these will be balanced by some of the negative effects from these developments, given the land requirements and use of greenfield land. The policy makes specific reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The legal requirement for local planning authorities to ensure that internationally and nationally designated sites are given the strongest level of protection and that development does not have adverse effects on the integrity of sites of European or international importance for nature conservation would be unchanged by revocation of this policy.</p> <p>It should also be noted that in response to the Thames Basin Heath SPA concerns, Councils with the Heaths, and other partners have now established the Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership to guarantee the delivery of new homes and the long term protection of the SPA. Many councils in the Heaths now offer suitable alternative natural green space (SANG) away from the SPA and its nesting birds and plants. The Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership adopted a long term Strategy in February 2009 (the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Delivery Framework). This will continue to ensure the appropriate mitigation strategy remains in place.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Orange	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	<p>Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of housing delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of development and housing is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy WCBV4: THE BLACKWATER VALLEY

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy requires Blackwater Valley authorities will work together, and with other agencies, in order to plan and implement in an integrated way a shared vision for the area taking into account social, environmental and economic needs. The policy also requires that the local authorities should consider the phasing of housing delivery within the vicinity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA.</p> <p>The increased provision of housing is likely to lead to significant positive effects on the population and human health in the medium to long term. However, this will also depend on related factors such as the quality of the houses, their density, location relative to green spaces and ambient air quality.</p> <p>The demand for construction materials and energy is likely to increase, as is traffic in the region, while the amount of waste generated is also likely to increase. These are likely to have negative on material assets, air quality and climatic factors. The provision of additional housing will have a negative impact on water resources.</p> <p>The effects on biodiversity are negative; however, the commitment in the policy to phase development and for Natural England to monitor and review the effects is critical to avoidance of damage to a European designated site.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	-	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need to balance growth and the effects in the area.</p> <p>Authorities will make use of the duty to cooperate in this area, given that the Blackwater Valley straddles a number of authorities in a number of counties.</p> <p>The policy makes specific reference to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The legal requirement for local planning authorities to ensure that internationally and nationally designated sites are given the strongest level of protection and that development does not have adverse effects on the integrity of sites of European or international importance for nature conservation would be unchanged by revocation of this policy.</p> <p>It should also be noted that in response to the Thames Basin Heath SPA concerns, Councils with the Heaths, and other partners have now established the Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership to guarantee the delivery of new homes and the long term protection of the SPA. Many councils in the Heaths now offer suitable alternative natural green space (SANG) away from the SPA and its nesting birds and plants. The Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership adopted a long term Strategy in February 2009 (the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Delivery Framework). This will continue to ensure the appropriate mitigation strategy remains in place.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Orange	White	Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	<p>Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of housing delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of development and housing is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy WCBV5: THE COLNE VALLEY PARK

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy requires local authorities to work together and with other agencies to deliver the aims of the Colne Valley Park. These include the maintenance and enhancement of the landscape (including settlements) and waterscape of the Park; to safeguard existing areas of countryside from inappropriate development; to conserve the asset to provide accessible facilities and opportunities for countryside.</p> <p>The Colne Valley Park comprises some 17 hectares encompassing parts of the WCBV, the London Borough of Hillingdon and Three Rivers District in Hertfordshire. It provides the first significant area of countryside to the west of London.</p> <p>The effects of such a policy are considered to be positive across all SEA topics.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not affect the outcomes of this policy.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Paragraph 114 of the NPPF provides the same policy approach as the regional strategy to the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of green infrastructure. Paragraph 117 states that planning policies should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries; • identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation; • promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan; • aim to prevent harm to geological conservation interests; and • where Nature Improvement Areas are identified in Local Plans, consider specifying the types of development that may be appropriate in these Areas. <p>Policy S9 of the adopted Core Strategy (2011) for the Three Rivers District includes commitments to conserve and enhance the countryside and the diversity of landscapes (and includes reference to the Colne Valley). Under PSP1 concerning development around Rickmansworth, there is a clause which states that the authority will conserve and enhance the unique natural landscape, biodiversity and habitat surrounding the town, including in the River Chess Valley to the east and the River Colne Valley to the south, including the Colne Valley Park.</p> <p>The London Borough of Hillingdon's Core Strategy is at Examination stage. Under policy EM3, the policy EM3 the Council is committed to working with partners to achieve environmental and habitat improvements in the Colne Valley Regional Park.</p> <p>The NPPF in conjunction with the commitments in the Core Strategies provides for a similar degree of protection and commitment to enhancement as the regional strategy policy and so</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															benefits are considered to be the maintained. <u>Mitigation Measures</u> None <u>Assumptions</u> None <u>Uncertainty</u> None

RS Policy CO1: CORE STRATEGY

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy for Central Oxfordshire sets out to create a minimum 18,000 additional jobs by 2016 and to deliver 40,680 net additional dwellings by 2026. The strategy for the sub-region seeks to build on the sub-region's economic strengths in education, science and technology to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. ensure the provision of infrastructure which is essential to the proper functioning and future development of the area ii. protect and enhance the environment and quality of life of the sub-region iii. protect the setting and character of Oxford iv. make best use of previously developed land within urban areas to reduce the need for greenfield development v. concentrate development where the need to travel, particularly by single occupancy car use, can be reduced. <p>This last point seeks to strengthen the public transport network, promote alternatives to car and lorry traffic and tackle congestion.</p> <p>The main locations for development will be Bicester, Didcot, Wantage and Grove. Focus on development is within existing settlement boundaries and within and immediately adjacent to the built-up area of Oxford. Options regarding the location, level and form of employment or other development, including the possible use of land at and in the immediate vicinity of the currently safeguarded sites around Oxford, will be a matter for local determination. While</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?	<p>contributing in due part to the regional reuse of previously developed land target of 60%, some greenfield development that includes housing, will be necessary. The saved Structure Plan policy regarding the development of land at RAF Upper Heyford would ensure that the site and the associated conservation of the heritage interest would be safeguarded until adoption of the Proposed Submission draft Cherwell Local Plan.</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment opportunities and housing; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on large urban extensions on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material assets, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment. In addition, there statutory duties on organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies (in this case Thames Water) to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for growth in the sub-region .</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>opportunities and housing; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material assets, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate).</p> <p>NPPF policies relating to planning strategically across local boundaries (paragraphs 156 an 178-181) will mean that local authorities should continue to ensure that land use and local transport policies are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their area.</p> <p>Growth is focused on: Oxford. Bicester, Didcot, Wantage and Grove. The status of the relevant local planning documents in each case are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Oxford City Core Strategy was adopted March 2011. The Core Strategy seeks to deliver at least the SEP target of 8,000 dwellings. The SHLAA Update Report 1b concluded that based on existing identified sites there would be a shortfall of the 8,000 target by 1,648 dwellings. To meet the requirement the authority would rely on windfalls. The Cherwell Local Plan was adopted in 1996 and had housing figures out to 2011. A non-statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 was approved as interim planning policy and a Proposed Submission draft of the Cherwell Local Plan is currently planned for submission in the Autumn. The saved Structure Plan policy regarding the development of land at RAF Upper Heyford would be unaffected by revocation and the conservation of the heritage interest of the site would be safeguarded until adoption of the Proposed Submission draft Cherwell Local Plan. South Oxfordshire Local Plan was adopted in 2006 and covered till 2011. Housing provision is divided between Didcot - about 5,000 dwellings (with a further 500 dwellings in the Vale of the White Horse District at Didcot) and the rest of South Oxfordshire - 3000 dwellings. There is no housing figure beyond 2011. The current policy states that, whilst sufficient land will be released for housing development to ensure that the housing provisions are met, development which would cause these provisions to be significantly exceeded will not be permitted

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Vale of the White Horse District Local Plan (adopted July 2006) saved policies refers to the Structure Plan which requires that some 7,150 homes be provided in the Vale between 2001 and 2016. A Core Strategy is being developed that will be based on the housing requirement as set out in the South East Plan. West Oxfordshire - West Oxfordshire District Local Plan (adopted Jun 2006) saved policies refers to the Structure Plan which distributes 6,800 additional dwellings to the District during the period 2001–2016. The council is now revising its draft Core Strategy in line with the NPPF and to address other locally significant issues (Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)) concerning a reduction in housing requirements at Carterton and Secretary of State for Transport letter concerning support for a decision of a Planning Inspector not to confirm the necessary compulsory purchase and associated orders needed for a relief traffic scheme in Witney). <p>The policy anticipated that to deliver the level of growth would require sustainable urban extensions to a number of settlements including Oxford, Didcot and Grove and a selective review of the Oxford Green Belt. It is now less certain, given the varying status of the relevant local authority plans, whether development will be located in this way. However, revocation of the policy will not remove the need for growth in the sub-region given the inherent strengths of the local economy, with the education, knowledge intensive and high technology businesses, motorsport, car manufacture, publishing, retail and tourism sectors of particular importance. Until all LPAs have adopted up to date NPPF compliant Local Plans the effects in the short and medium term may be affected.</p> <p>In the long term, there will be potential significant benefits as development proceeds in line with local community aspirations.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Yellow	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	<p>Assumption</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing, remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of development and housing is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy CO2: ECONOMY

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy requires that local authorities will provide for the requirements of activities which contribute to regional and local priorities for economic development. Priority should be given to development which supports educational, scientific and technological sectors and responds to the needs of established and emerging clusters within the county.</p> <p>Additional land for employment will be provided where justified at Bicester and Didcot, for the expansion and relocation of existing local firms to foster knowledge-based industry.</p> <p>In Oxford, development for employment uses will be expected to take place primarily on previously developed land and former safeguarded land or in conjunction with development schemes for mixed uses. Development in Oxford city centre provided it is consistent with the protection of Oxford's architectural and historic heritage.</p> <p>The policy looked to create an additional 18,000 jobs (by 2016).</p> <p>The policy promotes the concept of sustainable communities by looking to deliver economic growth alongside other housing, social and environmental development. Within Oxford the overall aim will be to achieve a broad balance between housing and jobs. It is acknowledged that land should not be used for development to the north of Oxford if it impacts on the vitality of other local settlements.</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment; however, there will be minor negative effects from some of these developments, where development will be located on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, greater use of material</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>assets, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions and an adverse impact on climate)., although it is recognised that the focus of the policy is on using existing employment land as efficiently as possible.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the development provision on the environment. In addition, there statutory duties on organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies (in this case Thames Water) to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for employment opportunities within the sub-region.</p> <p>The Oxfordshire City Region Local Economic Partnership (LEP) and adjoining LEPs are taking forward setting the conditions for economic development in the sub-region.</p> <p>Growth is focused on priority sectors (education, scientific and technology) at Oxford, Bicester and Didcot. The status of local planning documents in each case is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Oxford City Core Strategy was adopted in March 2011. Based on the supplementary guidance from the South East England Partnership Board, the district

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>was apportioned 7,111 jobs over the period of the SE Plan. Development to be concentrated within the city, avoiding any development that would affect Oxford's character, and focuses new development on previously developed land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Cherwell Local Plan was adopted 1996 and had employment figures out to 2011. South Oxfordshire Local Plan was adopted in 2006 and covered till 2011. The plan emphasises that in 1996 the land supply for employment (in Class B uses) was just over 400 hectares and that this could provide for about 30,000 jobs. No other targets are given. <p>Revoking this policy will remove the restriction on the policy that employment land should be provided for the expansion or relocation of local firms at Bicester and Didcot until the Local Plans have been revised. In so doing, Cherwell DC and South Oxfordshire will have reference to the NPPF. In particular, the key planning principles set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF (to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs) and paragraphs 18-22 (which deal with building a strong, competitive economy).</p> <p>This means that there will be some uncertainty regarding development around Didcot and Bicester in the short and medium term leading to a lessening of the effects identified for retention. Although in the long term the significant effects are likely to be similar to retention. This will include the significant effects on population from the creation of employment opportunities and improved connectivity.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Yellow	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects are likely to be less in the short and medium term.</p>

RS Policy CO3: SCALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy for Central Oxfordshire sets out to deliver 40,680 net additional dwellings by 2026. The policy recognises that local planning authorities should work collaboratively to facilitate the delivery of the additional dwellings in the sub-region. These are apportioned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherwell (part) 6,400 • Oxford 8,000 • South of Oxford SDA 4,000 • South Oxfordshire 8,240 • Vale of White Horse 10,240 • West Oxfordshire (part) 3,800 <p>The policy also requires that 40% of all new housing should be affordable.</p> <p>While contributing in due part to the regional reuse of previously developed land target of 60%, some greenfield development that includes housing, will be necessary. . A successful legal challenge is likely to remove the requirement for the Strategic Development Area (and 4,000 dwellings from South Oxfordshire); however, as the form of relief is yet to be determined, the status of the housing numbers is unclear. As the SDA was likely to be in greenfield land, this removal lessens the pressures from this development in Southern Oxfordshire (but this does not extend across the rest of the sub-region).</p> <p>The increased provision of housing is likely to lead to significant positive effects on the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>population and human health in the medium to long term. The requirement that 40% of new housing will be affordable will benefit lower income families and reflects housing affordability ratios that are among the worst in the region. Overall positive effects on population will also depend on related factors such as the quality of the houses, their density, location relative to green spaces and ambient air quality.</p> <p>The demand for construction materials and energy is likely to increase, as is traffic in the region, while the amount of waste generated is also likely to increase. These are likely to have a negative impact on material assets, air quality and climatic factors.</p> <p>Given that some of the development will be located on a large urban extension on greenfield land, it has been anticipated that there would be negative effects on biodiversity from land take. In addition development would require greater water resource use and is likely to cause increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions. Uncertainty is identified in the medium and long term for cultural heritage and landscape due to potential review of Green Belt (see SP4).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment. In addition, there are statutory duties on organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies (in this case Thames Water) to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	0	-	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for growth in the sub-region. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities in order to achieve this objective. Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it will have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur, dependent on the status of local plans (hence the uncertainties identified in the long term).</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the provision of new homes in the sub-region</p> <p>Housing development will be focused on: Oxford, Bicester, Didcot, and Wantage and Grove. The status of the relevant local planning documents in each case is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Oxford City Core Strategy was adopted in March 2011. The Core Strategy seeks to deliver at least the SEP target of 8,000 dwellings. The SHLAA Update Report 1b concluded that based on existing identified sites there would be a shortfall of the 8,000 target by 1,648 dwellings. To meet the requirement the authority would rely on windfalls. The Cherwell Local Plan was adopted in 1996 and had housing figures out to 2011. A non-statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 was approved as interim planning policy and a Proposed Submission draft of the Cherwell Local Plan is currently planned for submission in the Autumn. South Oxfordshire Local Plan was adopted in 2006 and covered till 2011. Housing provision is divided between Didcot - about 5,000 dwellings (with a further 500 dwellings in the Vale of the White Horse District at Didcot) and the rest of South Oxfordshire - 3000 dwellings. There is no housing figure beyond 2011. The current policy states that whilst sufficient land will be released for housing development to ensure that the housing provisions are met, development which would cause these provisions to be significantly exceeded will not be permitted. The Vale of the White Horse District Local Plan (adopted Jul 2006) saved policies refers

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Yellow	Orange	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	<p>to the Structure Plan which requires that some 7,150 homes be provided in the Vale between 2001 and 2016. A Core Strategy is being developed that will be based on the housing requirement as set out in the South East Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> West Oxfordshire - West Oxfordshire District Local Plan (adopted Jun 2006) saved policies refers to the Structure Plan which distributes 6,800 additional dwellings to the District during the period 2001–2016. The council is now revising its draft Core Strategy in line with the NPPF and to address other locally significant issues (Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)) concerning a reduction in housing requirements at Carterton and a Secretary of State for Transport letter concerning support for a decision of a Planning Inspector not to confirm the necessary compulsory purchase and associated orders needed for a relief traffic scheme in Witney). <p>The policy anticipated that to deliver the level of growth would require sustainable urban extensions to a number of settlements including Oxford, Didcot and Grove and a selective review of the Oxford Green Belt (SP4). It is now less certain, given the varying status of the relevant local authority plans whether development will be located in this way. However, revocation of the policy will not remove the need for new homes in the sub-region given the inherent strengths of the local economy, population projections and current housing affordability.</p> <p>Whilst the other local authorities have yet to revise their Local plans, Oxford's Core Strategy includes a policy on affordable housing where the percentage of affordable housing required on a new development (50%) clearly exceeds that in the guidance given in the SE Plan policy (40%).</p> <p>Until all LPAs have adopted up to date NPPF compliant Local Plans the effects in the short and medium term will be lessened. In the long term, there will be potential significant effects on population as development proceeds in line with local community aspirations. In revising the Local Plans, LPAs will need to take into account paragraph 159 of the NPPF which states that local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should prepare Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Yellow	Orange	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Orange	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	<p>administrative boundaries.</p> <p>NPPF policies relating to planning strategically across local boundaries (paragraphs 156 and 178-181) will mean that local authorities should continue to ensure that land use and local transport policies are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their area.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, in the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of development and housing is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy CO4: GREEN BELT

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy requires that a Green Belt will be maintained around Oxford to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. preserve the special character and landscape setting of Oxford ii. check the growth of Oxford and prevent ribbon development and urban sprawl iii. prevent the coalescence of settlements iv. assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment v. assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>The Policy also allows for a selective review of Green Belt boundaries on the southern edge of Oxford. However, the policy for a selective review of the Green Belt to the south of Oxford and the development of the South Oxford Strategic Development Area (with a housing allocation of 4,000 dwellings) was challenged and conceded but the precise form of relief, at that time, was not agreed. The Inspectors comments on the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy include the following: <i>'The South East Plan proposed a 'South of Oxford Strategic Development Area' of 4,000 dwellings within this District, adjoining the City boundary. The Treasury Solicitor conceded a legal challenge to this as insufficient sustainability appraisal had been undertaken of possible alternative locations for meeting the wider housing needs of the City. Any provision of development on that scale would need to have been preceded by joint work and sustainability appraisal of reasonable alternative options involving the City and all of its adjoining authorities.'</i></p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Retention of the CO4 would ensure that selective reviews of the South Oxfordshire Green Belt would be considered in any future reviews of the either the Oxford Core Strategy or South Oxfordshire Local Plan. It remains uncertain however, whether this would be the case given that the interim relief in respect of the concessions made in relation to legal challenges on these policies is yet to be agreed.</p> <p>Depending on the outcome of any review (and any changes), this policy could largely maintain the existing situation with benefits to landscape and cultural heritage. It would also have benefits across the other SEA criteria (except material assets).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>The policy seeks to protect the extent of the Green Belt over the life of the regional strategy, but it indicates that it may need to be revisited in the review of the strategy. It is assumed that in the absence of a legal basis for future RS review, the policy would remain in the long term.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Whether a Green Belt review would be undertaken and if so what implications it would have for land take and development.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The content of policy CS4 of the Oxford City Core Strategy (adopted 2011) states that:</p> <p><i>'The general extent of the Green Belt inside Oxford's boundaries will be maintained. Within the Green Belt, planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development, in accordance with national policy. The Northern Gateway AAP will consider small scale, minor changes to the Green Belt boundary.'</i></p> <p>The Green Belt preserves the setting and special character of Oxford. It provides opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation. The policy only allows for land to be released</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>from the Green Belt if exceptional circumstances are shown to exist and specific criteria are met (such as need; the site is not in the undeveloped floodplain; development would not result in the loss of a designated ecological feature; and development would not result in the loss of land in active recreational use).</p> <p>Under revocation, planning policy would include reference to the NPPF which seeks to protect the Green Belt (section 9) and establishes that the fundamental aim of the green belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The current Local Plans are the Oxford City Core Strategy, adopted in March 2011 and the South Oxfordshire Local Plan (2011). There is no mention in the Oxford City Core Strategy of a selective review of Green Belt boundaries on the southern edge of Oxford. The South Oxfordshire Local Plan (2011) includes a policy (GB1) setting out the boundaries to the Green Belt and not anticipating any change. In consequence, it is concluded that revocation of the South East Plan is likely to lead to a lessening of the pressure on the Oxford Green Belt to the south of the city compared to retention, as the presence of the policy would be consideration in any future reviews of the either the Oxford Core Strategy or South Oxfordshire Local Plan. Any review of the current policy will be subject to the NPPF which maintains strong protections for Green Belt land.</p> <p>So whilst revocation of this policy would remove the policy pressure for review, it wouldn't prevent a LPA undertaking a review if considered appropriate, subject to consistency with national policy.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>As with retention, it is uncertain whether there would be any reviews of the respective Local Plans and what the implications of such reviews could be, although the probability is lower in the short and medium term following revocation.</p>

RS Policy CO5: TRANSPORT

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy anticipates the need for Oxfordshire County Council, working with the Highways Agency, Network Rail and others to provide a co-ordinated approach to the effective management and development of transport networks in Central Oxfordshire. This will be done in order to meet both strategic and local access requirements while reducing the need to travel, and encouraging the use of more sustainable modes where there is a need to travel.</p> <p>There are significant positive scores for air quality and climate as a consequence of reducing the need to travel and reducing the transport intensity of economic activity, including freight. Encouraging cycling and walking as well as reducing income disparities, increasing resilience and providing opportunities / access to services for all will have a significant positive impact on population and human health. The policy also seeks to improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>The policy is reflected in the RES which recognises the importance of a transport system that fully supports sustainable economic growth. To support this, the RES includes a number of transport specific priorities including investment in transport to maximise economic growth and reduce the environmental impacts of moving goods and people.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Many of the effects will depend on the ability to change travel behaviour and the demand for transport. It is also uncertain what impacts transport infrastructure will have – particularly environmental impacts of new road construction.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>As with retention of the policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities will operate under the duty to cooperate to deliver positive outcomes.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Many of the effects will depend on the ability to change travel behaviour and the demand for transport. It is also uncertain what impacts transport infrastructure will have – particularly environmental impacts of new road construction.</p>

RS Policy MKAV1: Housing Distribution by District 2006-2026

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This sets housing provision for the Milton Keynes Unitary Authority (41,360) and within Aylesbury Vale District (26,899) for the period 2006 – 2026.</p> <p>The provision for ‘in and around’ Milton Keynes (34,160) is presumed to be split between expansion areas/greenfield sites (23,750) with the remainder from the urban area.</p> <p>Future growth of Milton Keynes to the east of the M1 would depend on a further review of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Provision of this level of housing in an area under great pressure for residential property would be of significant benefit to the population.</p> <p>The development predicted would include areas of green belt and would have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soils, landscape and cultural heritage. The use of construction materials would have an adverse impact on material assets. Generation of increased traffic would have an adverse impact on air quality and climate. Additional requirement for water use would have a significant adverse impact on water resources in the medium to long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan on environment, water and transport seek to mitigate the effects of growth set out for the sub-region.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>
Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for growth in the sub-region. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities in order to achieve this objective. Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it will have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur, dependent on the status of local plans.</p> <p>Revocation would mean that the relevant local plans do not have to conform to this Development Plan policy for urban extensions around Aylesbury or the south east of Milton Keynes.</p> <p>Neither of the adopted local plans post date the RS – (Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan, 2004; Milton Keynes District Local Plan, 2005). Aylesbury Vale District’s Core Strategy which sought to conform to the South East Plan, was withdrawn. The Core Strategy for Milton Keynes, which is undergoing public examination (July 2012), no longer supports the housing provision included within the South East Plan (see MKAV2). The draft strategy sets a short term (0-5 year) target of 1,750 dwellings per year which can be met from the existing commitment. This level of provision is lower than the 2,218 per year within MKAV 2). The draft strategy is committed to an early review which may lead to higher targets in the longer term.</p> <p>In the short to medium term, there is a high probability that the dwellings delivered will not meet the RS target. As a consequence the beneficial impacts on the population will be lower than would be expected if the policy was implemented.</p> <p>Generation of increased traffic would have an adverse impact on air quality and climate in the long term but the impact in the medium term is uncertain.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Yellow	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan on environment, water and transport seek to mitigate the effects of growth set out for the sub region.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The extent of impacts on biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and landscape will be governed, principally, by the extent of green field development (see MKA2 and MKA3). On the basis that this is unlikely to occur in the short term to medium term, the impact on these three aspects is considered to be neutral. Longer term impacts are uncertain.</p>

RS Policy MKAV2: Spatial Framework for Milton Keynes Growth Area

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
Retention	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy sets out the details for housing provision (44,350 dwellings) and employment (44,350 jobs) in Milton Keynes. Development is to be achieved through urban intensification and two strategic development areas (SDAs), one to the south east and the other to the south west of Milton Keynes. 30% of development is to be affordable. Employment related development is to be focused on Central Milton Keynes, Bletchley, Wolverton and Newport Pagnell. Local transport and water infrastructure is to be enhanced and upgraded through: upgraded core bus network; high quality public transport in East-West and North-South corridors; park and ride and strategic water infrastructure improvements. The two SDAs cross administrative boundaries and will be subject to comprehensive master-planning to provide mixed use sustainable communities.</p> <p>The proposals for employment and housing provision would have a significant positive impact on population and human health. There will be adverse impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape, particularly through development of the SDAs on green field sites. However, in view of the planning required for these developments which includes masterplanning and water studies, there will be little impact in the short to medium term and potentially minor/significant adverse impact in the long term. There may also be an adverse impact on cultural heritage associated with the new development on green field land, dependent on the proximity of sites of historic and cultural importance.</p> <p>Development on this scale would potentially place significant pressure on water resources, although improvement to water service infrastructure is a key requirement of the policy. Therefore the impact is considered to be minor adverse, although there may be no impact</p>		

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>dependent on the extent of infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The development will potentially have an adverse impact on air quality and climate. However, the policy places emphasis on public transport infrastructure and the construction of new SDAs provides an opportunity to develop a holistic transport policy from the outset. The impact on air quality and climate is predicted to be minor adverse.</p> <p>Use of construction materials will have a significant adverse impact on material assets, and the scale of development will place pressure on waste management capacity.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The policy requires that development is informed by strategic flood risk assessments and water cycle studies which should mitigate potential flood and water shortage issues. Emphasis within the policy on improved public transport would reduce potential impacts on air quality and climate. The policy requires careful planning in order to enhance green infrastructure and to reduce impact on landscape character. Increased plan targets for recycled and secondary aggregates (M2).</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Proximity of development to sites of historical/archaeological significance and long term impact on cultural heritage.</p>
Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	-	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	-	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The Milton Keynes revised Core Strategy (amended) is undergoing public examination (July 2012). With respect to housing provision a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for the Borough proposed provision of 3,280 homes per year, compared to the South East Plan target of 2,620. However this is considered by the council to be unachievable, and a short/medium term target has been set based on existing provision of 1,750 per year. This can be met principally from existing sites with no requirement for two new strategic</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Yellow	White	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	White	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Orange	White	<p>development areas.</p> <p>The lower housing provision could have a less positive effect on population and human health, although housing need is to be reviewed in the context of the requirements of the South East Midlands LEP. There may be a similar outcome in terms of economic growth as the Core Strategy aims to encourage 'high value' business providing well paid employment opportunities. The Core Strategy is well advanced and therefore will provide certainty to developers in planning terms for the short term. The benefits to population and human health are considered to be minor to significant.</p> <p>Focusing development in urban areas, and not in new settlements on greenfield land, will reduce the potential impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape. However, there is a significant gap in provision of housing between the ongoing annual target of 1,750, and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment of 3,280 (RS policy is 2,620). In the long term there is potential for significantly more growth than assumed in the South East Plan. In view of the uncertainty, long term impacts on biodiversity, soil, landscape and cultural heritage are uncertain. There will also be adverse impacts on water, air quality, and climate, dependent on policies adopted within the Core Strategy, and a similar long term uncertainty.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Strategic policies within the NPPF aimed at achieving sustainable transport; environmental protection, and good design. UK legislative protection for biodiversity. Policies within the Core Strategy to ensure environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Outcome of examination of Core Strategy and subsequent review of housing requirement.</p>

RS Policy MKAV3: Spatial Framework for Aylesbury Growth Area

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
Retention	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	+	0	0	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy for housing sets a target of 21,500 new dwellings for the period 2006 – 2026. An additional 5,390 dwellings to be provided in the Milton Keynes strategic development area. A new and enhanced public transport system to be provided to support this development. A long-term strategic framework is to be established with the focus of: identification of new housing land; identification of strategic employment sites; urban renaissance of the town; sustainable transport system and increased employment of 21,500 jobs.</p> <p>The provision of economic growth, housing, and the policy requirement for larger scale recreational facilities will have a significant positive impact on population and human health.</p> <p>A new development on green field land will have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape in the longer term.</p> <p>Urban renaissance of the town centre will have a positive impact on cultural heritage.</p> <p>The proposed level of development will have a negative impact on air quality, climate, water and material assets in the medium to long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Focus within the policy on re-use of land. Development of enhanced public transport systems would potentially mitigate adverse impact on air quality and climate.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p>		

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty None</p>
Revocation	0	0	?	0	+	+	0	0	?	0	?		-	0	?	-	0	?	-	?		?	-		0	0	0	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Aylesbury District Council withdrew its Core Strategy in October 2010 and has carried out consultations as a basis for a new plan. Current draft plans predict significantly lower provision of jobs and homes in the period to 2031 (9,000 homes and 6,000 jobs). In addition there is no requirement for the new strategic housing adjacent to Milton Keynes.</p> <p>As it is unlikely that Aylesbury Vale District will provide the level of housing or employment predicted by the South East plan and therefore there will be a minor positive impact on population and human health.</p> <p>The lower level of development, combined with no strategic provision in green belt, will have less impact on biodiversity, soil, water resources, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape, although in the longer term are likely to be negative. Generation of increased, development related, traffic would have an adverse impact on air quality and climate.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Strategic policies within the NPPF aimed at achieving sustainable transport; environmental protection, and good design. UK legislative protection for biodiversity. Policies within the Core Strategy to ensure environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Strategic development in green belt not implemented.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The extent of impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, air, climate change, material assets and landscape will be governed, principally, by the extent of green field development. On the basis that this is unlikely to occur in the short term term, the impact on these three topics is likely to occur at some point in the medium term; however, it remains uncertain when.</p>

RS Policy MKAV4: Effective Delivery

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary	
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L		
Retention	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy sets out the delivery mechanism for achieving the sub-regional strategy which includes an Inter-Regional Board, and two Local Delivery Vehicles. The intention is that progress will be monitored regularly and that, given the scale of growth, there should be programmed provision of high quality community, economic, environmental and social infrastructure services.</p> <p>The provision of environmental infrastructure would have a significant positive impact on human health and population and water. There may also be positive benefit to air quality and climate in the longer term.</p> <p>Delivery of the strategy will have the impacts associated with the individual components of the sub-region identified in MKAV2 and MKAV3.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>As for MKAV2 and MKAV3</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-			<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Within this area the South East Midlands LEP is taking forward the delivery of sustainable development.</p> <p>Aylesbury Vale Advantage will merge into the LEP. The Milton Keynes Partnership Committee (MKPC) has been disbanded and the work carried out by Milton Keynes Partnership forms part of the Homes and Communities Agency's (HCA) Midlands area. The work of inward investment is carried out by Milton Keynes Council.</p> <p>A revised delivery mechanism has therefore been established and the outcome would have similar impacts to that envisaged in the RS.</p> <p>The principles of sustainable development are retained within the NPPF.</p> <p>Any differences in impact would relate to the detail of development agreed going forward, rather than the mechanism for its delivery.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None</p>

RS Policy GAT1: CORE STRATEGY, GAT2 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND GAT 3 HOUSING DISTRIBUTION

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy sets out the strategy to maximise opportunities arising from the Gatwick-Crawley area, recognising the need to maintain the importance of Gatwick Airport as an international gateway and the links between the sub-region and London and the South Coast. The strategy recognises the need to balance growth opportunities in an area containing significant environmental assets including the High Weald and South Downs AONBs.</p> <p>Gatwick Airport is the single most important element of the area's economy and is of significant economic importance to the Region as a whole. The airport has helped to foster clusters of employment in the chemicals and pharmaceutical industries, in financial services and there are a number of aviation-related industries in Crawley</p> <p>Policy GAT2 seeks to increase employment and economic growth, capitalising on the airport, seeking to accommodate a net increase of 17,400 jobs will be needed during the first part of the Plan period between 2006 and 2016.</p> <p>Policy GAT3 seeks to ensure that local planning authorities will allocate sufficient land and facilitate the delivery of 36,000 net additional dwellings in the Gatwick sub-region between 2006 and 2026.</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment opportunities and housing; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development will be located on large urban extensions on greenfield land in Mid Sussex (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	<p>field sites, greater water resource use, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased air emissions).</p> <p>Policy GAT2 anticipates the continued functioning of Gatwick Airport to serve the needs of the business community, recognising its major employment role and attractiveness for world class business investment in the sub-region. The policy seeks to capitalise on the economic role for Gatwick Airport which will have beneficial effects on employment opportunity in the sub-region; however, it is unclear whether such growth would envisage an increase in flight movements (which would be associated with air quality issues, local nuisance and increase greenhouse gas emissions).</p> <p>It is also noted that the provision for development at Crawley is contingent on the findings of a water cycle study which highlights localised stresses on water resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Many of the policies in the Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment. In addition, there statutory duties on organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for growth in the sub-region</p> <p>There are potential significant benefits on population from the creation of employment opportunities and housing; however, there will be negative effects from these developments, given that some of the development could be located on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of green field sites, greater water resource use, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased air emissions).</p> <p>Growth is focused on four locations: Crawley, Horsham, Haywards Heath and East Grinstead. The status of the relevant local planning documents in each case is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crawley Core Strategy (adopted 2007) reflects the adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 which requires Crawley to guarantee a land supply of 4500 units (300pa). Core Strategy ensures adequate provision of employment land to ensure economic growth for the town as well as the wider economic area. • Horsham Core Strategy (adopted 2007) provides for at least 10,575 homes and associated infrastructure in the District within the period 2001-2018. It includes the westward expansion of Crawley with 2,500 homes and the development of land west of Horsham for 2,000 homes. The plan also makes provision for the development of some 210,000 square metres of employment floorspace within the period 2001-2018. • Mid Sussex Local Plan was adopted in 2004 and includes both Haywards Heath and East Grinstead. Housing targets beyond 2006 were not specified. The district has produced a consultation draft Local Plan which was subject to consultation in 2011. This document proposed an overall District housing requirement as 530 per annum, or 10,600 between 2011- 2031. The document also identified as a broad location, up to 40 hectares of employment land at Burgess Hill, as a "high quality campus style business park" along the A2300 strategic transport corridor <p>The policy anticipated that to deliver the level of growth would require sustainable urban extensions (for Crawley, Horsham, East Grinstead and Burgess Hill). It is now less certain, given the varying status of the relevant local authority plans, whether development will be</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>located in this way. However, revocation of the policy will not remove the need for new homes in the sub-region given the inherent strengths of the local economy, population projections and current housing affordability. At present, the quantum of development is lower than that envisaged in the SE Plan.</p> <p>Until all LPAs have adopted up to date NPPF compliant Local Plans the effects in the short and medium term will be lessened. In the long term, there will be potentially significant effects on population as development proceeds in line with local community aspirations. In revising the Local Plans, LPAs will need to take into account paragraph 159 of the NPPF which states that local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should prepare Strategic Housing Market Assessments to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries.</p> <p>NPPF policies relating to planning strategically across local boundaries (paragraphs 156 an 178-181) will mean that local authorities should continue to ensure that land use and local transport policies are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their area.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of development and housing is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy IW1: Enabling Economic Regeneration

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This is a high level policy which gives priority to investment and other support to realise a 'step-change' in the economic performance of the Isle of Wight, and to actively support economic regeneration and renewal, improved quality tourism and inward investment. Key regeneration areas are identified at Ryde, Sandown Bay, Ventnor and West Wight. Infrastructure and inward investment is required in Medina Valley. The policy includes support for vocational excellence in composites, marine, aeronautical and construction related industries and associated academic institutions and provides a target of 7,000 new jobs between 2006 – 2016. The proposed housing provision is 10,400 dwellings between 2006 – 2026 (IW2).</p> <p>The local economy is characterised by low wage levels and restricted employment. This policy, which focuses on economic regeneration, the development of improved skills, and higher grade tourism would, if successful, have a significant positive impact on the economy and population.</p> <p>Provision of additional land for employment and housing, together with improved infrastructure, will potentially have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p> <p>The level of water stress on the Isle of Wight is defined as 'serious' by the Environment Agency, the highest category of designation. Additional development associated with economic regeneration would have a significant adverse impact on water resource requirement.</p> <p>The development required to ensure this economic growth will involve use of construction materials which will have an adverse impact on material assets. It is probable that the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>development would also increase traffic movements which would increase emissions to air and have a negative impact on air quality and climate.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment. Water resource planning (Water Resources Management Plan, Southern Water).</p> <p>Assumptions Economic regeneration takes place to achieve the envisaged 'step change'.</p> <p>Uncertainty The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The Isle of Wight Core Strategy (including minerals and waste) was adopted in March 2012. Other relevant documents include the Isle of Wight Economic Strategy (2008 – 2020).</p> <p>The initial stages of the Core Strategy were prepared taking into account the South East Plan. Following revocation of the RS, various aspects have been taken forward including the housing target, but changes have been made to employment provision and renewable energy.</p> <p>A strategic objective of the Core Strategy is 'To provide opportunities to diversify and strengthen the local economy and increasing the range of higher skilled jobs available locally.'</p> <p>Policy SP3 (Economy) states that economic growth over the plan period will be focussed upon employment, retail and high quality tourism, the target being to create 7,550 new jobs. Economic development will be located principally in Key and Smaller Regeneration Areas. The Core Strategy (SP1) identifies Key Regeneration Areas at: Medina Valley; Ryde and The</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	<p>Bay (Sandown, Shanklin and Lake), with Smaller Regeneration Areas at West Wight and Ventnor, and a number of Rural Service Centres. The emphasis on Medina, Ryde and The Bay is similar to the RS, with less emphasis on West Wight and Ventnor.</p> <p>The overall objectives of the RS and the Core Strategy are similar, and the emphasis is on economic development and improved skills. The Core Strategy should have a significant positive impact on the economy, and on the population.</p> <p>The strategy allows for at least 42 hectares of new economic development land which, in conjunction with the requirement for land for residential development to support the economic improvements, will have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p> <p>There is little material difference between the predicted outcome of the RS policy and the Core Strategy on economic development. Consequently the associated construction related impacts on material assets, water, air quality and climate are considered to be the same for both scenarios.</p> <p>The Core Strategy is in place and therefore the timescale over which new development will take place is considered to be the same as for the RS.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies within the Core Strategy relating to sustainability and protection of the environment (e.g.SP5) and ongoing water resource planning (Water Resources Management Plan, Southern Water).</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Economic regeneration takes place according to the plan.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of development and housing is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy IW2: Housing Development

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy requires provision of 10,400 additional dwellings within the plan period (2006 – 10,400), the annual average being 520. This housing is to be concentrated in Cowes, Newport, Ryde, Sandown and Shanklin. This provision is to include the regional target level of affordable housing.</p> <p>The existing low wage structure, and high level of second home ownership, means that there is a shortage of supply of affordable homes on the island. Provision of new housing, including affordable dwellings, will have a significant beneficial impact on the population.</p> <p>Land take incurred through development will have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p> <p>The level of water stress on the Isle of Wight is defined as ‘serious’ by the Environment Agency, the highest category of designation. Additional residential development would have a significant adverse impact on water in the medium to long term.</p> <p>The development required to ensure this housing provision will involve use of construction materials which will have an adverse impact on material assets. It is probable that the development would also increase traffic movements which would increase emissions to air and have a negative impact on air quality and climate.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment. Water resource planning (Water Resources Management Plan, Southern Water).</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Assumptions Economic conditions support this level of 'new build' and take up.</p> <p>Uncertainty The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas. In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>
Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Policy SP2 (Housing) of the Isle of White Core Strategy provides for 8,320 dwellings in the period 2011-2027, at an average of 520 per year. These are to be located: on land with existing permissions; Medina Valley, Ryde; The Bay; West Wight and Ventnor with some smaller development in Rural Service Centres. Policy DM4 sets out the provision of affordable housing, with 1,790 homes over the plan period.</p> <p>The target set in the Core Strategy was based on evidence used to inform the RS and the council considers that the annual target of 520 dwellings a year remains appropriate in order to meet the housing and economic aspirations for the island.</p> <p>This level of development, which includes identification of green field sites, will have the same impacts as predicted for the RS policy and, as the proposals do not differ from those within the RS, these will be over the same timeframe.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies within the Core Strategy relating to sustainability and protection of the environment (e.g.SP 5). Water resource planning (Water Resources Management Plan, Southern Water).</p> <p>Assumptions Economic conditions support this level of 'new build' and take up.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Light Green	Dark Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange	<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>As with retention of the policy, In the short to early medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of development and housing is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be less.</p>

RS Policy IW3: Rural Areas

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy recognises that rural areas on the island are less accessible, with fewer jobs and lower incomes. The policy aims to maintain and enhance the rural environment and biodiversity, both for its own sake and to encourage economic success. It identifies a need for rural diversification and small scale affordable housing provision.</p> <p>Economic development, including provision of small scale, affordable housing, would benefit the local population.</p> <p>The policy encourages the enhancement of the rural environment which would provide a benefit to biodiversity, soil and landscape. This benefit would be offset locally by any land take required to provide housing, although the net effect is considered to be minor positive.</p> <p>The development proposed is essentially small scale and is unlikely to cause greater levels of traffic. The consequent effect on air and climate would be neutral. While there is a significant issue relating to water supply on the island, the low level of development predicted is unlikely to have an impact on water resources and a neutral impact is predicted. The use of construction materials would have a minor adverse impact in the longer term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Development is small scale and integrated into existing development</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
																											<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>	
Revocation	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>While not explicitly mirroring the South East Plan, policies within the adopted Core Strategy support the objectives of the RS policy.</p> <p>With respect to the natural environment the objectives of the strategy include the protection, conservation and enhancement of the island's natural, historic and built environments. The Economic Strategy promotes the concept of a world renowned 'Eco-Island' which would be dependent on maintenance and enhancement of the natural environment. The strategy for the Eco Island has been developed by the Island Strategic Partnership (ISP) and will take effect between 2008-2020.</p> <p>Policy SP1 (Spatial Strategy) defines 11 Rural Service Areas which support a wider range of smaller, more rural villages. Development within the wider countryside will be focussed within or immediately adjacent to these areas. The Council states that it will particularly support 'proposals that contribute to and help diversify the rural economy and higher value added tourism is likely to be a main element of this' (para. 5.16). The policy aims to promote a ...rural economy based upon a diverse range of enterprises and skills'.</p> <p>The Council's policy with respect to provision of affordable housing (DM4) in rural communities makes provision for support to proposals for rural exception sites that deliver affordable housing outside of identified settlement boundaries. These are to be for affordable housing 'in perpetuity' and address the needs of the local community.</p> <p>The type and scale of development in rural areas envisaged by these policies would have the same positive impacts on the local population. Promotion of high quality eco-tourism in rural areas will be dependent on maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	<p>Due to the scale of development in rural areas, impacts on water, air and climate would be neutral with a minor adverse impact on material assets in the longer term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures N/A</p> <p>Assumptions Development is small scale and integrated into existing development.</p> <p>Uncertainty None</p>

RS Policy IW4: Strategic Transport Links

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	0	0	?	0	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires maintenance and improvement of the strategic cross-Solent links as part of an integrated transport approach at local level.</p> <p>The Island depends on these links for import and export of goods and people, including tourists and capacity issues occur during the summer. The policy supports a new transport interchange at Ryde, together with a potential second local transport hub.</p> <p>Efficient and more extensive use of the links would potentially provide economic benefit, by facilitating exports and increasing tourist numbers.</p> <p>The use of construction materials would have an adverse impact on material assets.</p> <p>Increased car transport would potentially increase air emissions which could have a deleterious impact on air quality and climate. If the construction of new facilities involved land take outside of existing structures this would have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape. The scale of these impacts is uncertain and dependent on the scale of any new development.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policy requires an integrated transport approach at a local level.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Scale of impacts dependent on extent of land used outside the existing boundaries, and implementation of successful travel planning to reduce traffic emissions.</p>
	0	0	?	0	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The Core Strategy is seeking to provide economic development, including through increased tourism, and the requirement to provide appropriate infrastructure to support the cross-Solent links is acknowledged (paragraph 2.42). Policy DM18 (Cross-Solent Travel) sets a target for expansion in passenger numbers of 10.6% over 2004, and sets out the requirements for development proposals. The focus is on provision of efficient use of existing facilities within the existing boundaries in the short to medium term. New development is to be in accordance with the objectives of the Transport Plan.</p> <p>Expansion envisaged by this policy is similar in extent to the South East Plan, and a similar range of impacts is predicted, with uncertainty over biodiversity, soil, air, climate and landscape in the medium to long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policy DM18 requires that the environmental and economic impacts of any proposed development is considered, and the scale of proposals are to reflect the capacity and sensitivity of the landscape and biodiversity of the island.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Scale of impacts dependent on extent of land used outside the existing boundaries, and implementation of successful travel planning to reduce traffic emissions.</p>

RS Policy IW5: Infrastructure

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
-Retention	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy requires provision of timely infrastructure to support regeneration objectives. Water efficiency is a particular issue and the policy provides for additional water resources and infrastructure in parallel with measures to improve efficiency.</p> <p>This policy will improve the water supply thereby having an economic benefit through support to employers and residents. There will be a positive impact on the population.</p> <p>The reference to infrastructure is assumed to include internal road links.</p> <p>Infrastructure construction is likely to involve land take which will have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape. Construction vehicles will generate local air emissions during the construction period which would have a short term negative impact on air quality and climate. The provision of upgraded roads would support higher levels of private transport which would also have a deleterious impact on air quality and climate.</p> <p>Construction materials will be used which will have a minor negative impact on material assets.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Design and location of infrastructure.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Policy encompasses roads and utilities.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																											<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>				
Revocation	0	?	-	0	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	0	0	0	?	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The emphasis in the adopted Core Strategy is on provision of an improved road network through the Isle of Wight Highways Private Finance Initiative (PFI). This is at an early stage with no appointed provider. With respect to utility infrastructure, the Infrastructure and Development Theme Group of the Local Strategic Partnership has determined that there is no need for major investment within the plan period. However, there is a requirement to ensure that new development uses water as efficiently as possible. The impact on water resources is uncertain.</p> <p>Policy SP7 supports development associated with the PFI, particularly infrastructure improvements in Newport.</p> <p>There would be a positive impact on the economy arising from provision of this infrastructure.</p> <p>Infrastructure construction is likely to involve land take which will have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape. Construction vehicles will generate local air emissions during the construction period which would have a short term negative impact on air quality and climate. The provision of upgraded roads would support higher levels of private transport which would also have a deleterious impact on air quality and climate.</p> <p>Construction materials will be used which will have a minor negative impact on material assets.</p> <p>The PFI provider has not yet been appointed and therefore the impacts would take place in the medium to long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Requirements of Sustainable Travel policy, DM17.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary	
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L		
	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	Light Green	Light Green	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	White	White	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	White	White	Orange	<p>Assumptions That a PFI provider will be appointed to implement the policy.</p> <p>Uncertainty Timing of development affects the timing of potential negative impacts, leaving uncertainty in the medium term for biodiversity, soil, air, climate change, material assets and landscape and in the long term for water. It remains uncertain whether the increased demand for water from additional development, could be accommodated through demand management and leakage reduction activities undertaken by Southern Water as part of its approach to water resource management. .</p>

RS Policy AOSR1: Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy sets a requirement for provision of 19,220 net dwellings for parts of Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire outside of the sub-regions. Within Cherwell District, specific reference is made to provision of new housing in Banbury, where flood alleviation works are also a priority.</p> <p>Provision of new housing will have a significant beneficial impact on the population.</p> <p>Land take incurred through development will have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p> <p>The development required to ensure the housing provision will involve use of construction materials which will have an adverse impact on material assets. It is probable that the development would increase traffic movements which would increase emissions to air and have a negative impact on air quality and climate. The additional development would also have a negative impact on water resources. Provision of flood alleviation at Banbury would have a positive impact on flood protection measures.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Economic conditions support this level of 'new build'</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Economic climate</p>
Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for growth in the sub-region. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 - 55) sets out the actions for local authorities in order to achieve this objective. Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it will have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur, dependent on the status of local plans.</p> <p>Within the area covered by this policy Chiltern District and Wycombe have adopted Core Strategies which are in compliance with the housing needs identified in the Regional Strategy. The Vale of White Horse has prepared a draft Core Strategy which initially intended to adopt the South East Plan but the Interim Housing Supply Policy was withdrawn in May 2012 leaving uncertainty regarding provision.</p> <p>The Draft Cherwell Local Plan (2012), West Berkshire and South Oxford Core Strategies are undergoing/pending examination. Cherwell makes a provision for the District which is consistent with the SE plan. South Oxfordshire has established a 5 year supply based on the housing figures within the south east plan. West Oxfordshire District has drafted its Core Strategy but progress has been delayed following a decision by the Department of Transport not to support a compulsory purchase order to proceed for the Cogges Link Road (Witney). Witney is outside the area considered in this policy.</p> <p>Within the Cherwell plan Banbury is expected to make a significant contribution to housing provision (4,352 new homes). Construction work commenced in February 2011 on a Flood Alleviation Scheme for Banbury, part funded by the local authority. This complies with the RS.</p> <p>The agreed/pending provision is broadly in line with the RS for those districts which have published draft or adopted plans. There is less certainty regarding the Vale of White Horse</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>and West Oxfordshire which accounts for 25% of the allocation. Some delay in construction is predicted in these areas as a consequence of the uncertainty which would lead to an associated delay in adverse environmental impacts.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Outcome of planning review of housing provisions in West Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse.</p>

RS Policy AOSR2: Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy sets the provision for 18,900 net additional dwellings in the rest of Hampshire. The allocation for East Hampshire (4,000) does not include the provision for Whitehill/Bordon.</p> <p>Provision of new housing would have a significant beneficial impact on the population.</p> <p>Land take incurred through development will have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p> <p>The development required to ensure the housing provision will involve use of construction materials which will have an adverse impact on material assets. It is probable that the development would also increase traffic movements which would increase emissions to air and have a negative impact on air quality and climate. The additional development would also have a negative impact on water resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Economic conditions support this level of 'new build'</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for growth. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities in order to achieve this objective. Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it will have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur, dependent on the status of local plans.</p> <p>The New Forest Core Strategy was adopted in October 2009 and the New Forest National Park Core Strategy in December 2010. Housing provisions within these strategies are consistent with the RS. Local Plans/Core Strategies are in draft form for Test Valley, Winchester and East Hampshire. Within each of these plans, the housing provision accords generally with the South East Plan but will be subject to final examination. Consequently ,85% of the total housing allocation within the policy is unconfirmed. While the overall scale of development is likely to be similar to the RS, the lack of confirmed plans will increase the extent of uncertainty and may delay housing provision. The effect of this may be to delay the significant positive benefit to the population, and any adverse impacts associated with development.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Adoption of strategies in draft and those yet to be prepared (Basingstoke and Dean, Hart)</p>

RS Policy AOSR3: The Whitehill/Bordon Opportunity

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires allocation of land within East Hampshire District for a new strategic development area at Whitehill/Bordon to include delivery of 5,500 net dwellings and to include: mixed housing types and new employment opportunities. The figure provided for housing is indicative, subject to ongoing work including a water cycle study. If the housing provision cannot be met it is not anticipated that the shortfall would be located elsewhere in the district.</p> <p>The provision of a strategic mixed development, including employment and housing, will have a beneficial impact on economic growth in the area and the population.</p> <p>The land has been used by the MOD for training purposes, and there may be ground contamination issues. Redevelopment would require soil remediation and this would have a beneficial effect on soils.</p> <p>Redevelopment could impact negatively on biodiversity and landscape. However, the policy requires new green infrastructure to support biodiversity and recreational opportunities. This would have the potential to redress any negative impacts and could result in an overall minor positive impact on biodiversity and landscape.</p> <p>A development of this scale would be likely to generate increased traffic and have an adverse impact on air quality and climate. However, the policy also requires a modal shift from private cars to other forms of transport. Provided that this objective is achieved the net effect on air quality and climate would be neutral.</p> <p>Development on this scale would use construction materials and have an adverse impact on material assets in the long term. There would also be a potential adverse impact on water resources although the extent of development is to be informed by a water cycle study which</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
																											<p>should have the benefit of ensuring that water conservation could be accommodated in the masterplan, and that the scale of development is matched to capacity. The impact on water resources is considered to be neutral.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Requirements of the policy relating to green infrastructure, travel planning and water resource management, together with capacity assessment.</p> <p>Assumptions Uncertainty Extent to which transport can be managed to minimise impacts on air quality.</p>	
Revocation	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The draft East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy is due for examination in October 2012. One of the objectives of the plan (4) is to provide 4,000 houses at Whitehill Bordon 'subject to environmental constraints'. A vision has been developed for an Eco-town. Policy CSWB1 relates to the strategic allocation of land at Whitehill Bordon for development. Since the RS was published further work has been carried out on transport, economy, energy, water and the town centre. The conclusion of these is that 4,000 dwellings could be provided without significant impact on the environment.</p> <p>Following adoption of the Core Strategy a Supplementary Planning Document will be prepared.</p> <p>In the event that the land does not become available for development the Secretary of State has confirmed that there will not be a need to find the same level of development elsewhere in Hampshire.</p> <p>Policy CSWB1 accords with the objective of the RS policy. Although the Core Strategy has yet to be adopted, this would not have a significant impact on the timing of the development which will be governed by a range of external factors including the time frame over which the land becomes available.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	<p>The positive and negative impacts identified with retention would also be anticipated following revocation.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None</p> <p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Some residual uncertainty until the Core Strategy is adopted.</p>

RS Policy AOSR4: Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy sets a housing target of 5,000 for Waverley District and no additional provision in Guildford, Mole Valley and Tandridge above that within Policy LF3.</p> <p>Provision of new housing would have a beneficial impact on the population.</p> <p>Land take incurred through development would have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape. It is noted that part of Waverley District is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and that policy NRM6 applies.</p> <p>The development required to ensure the housing provision will involve use of construction materials which will have an adverse impact on material assets. It is probable that the development would also increase traffic movements which would increase emissions to air and have a negative impact on air quality and climate. The additional development would also have a negative impact on water resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	0	?	?	0	?	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for growth in the sub-region. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities in order to achieve this objective. Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it will have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur, dependent on the status of local plans.</p> <p>The Waverley Borough Council LDF Core Strategy is in draft form. Policy CS2 sets out a target for 5,060 net additional homes from 2006 – 2028, equivalent to 230 dwellings a year. These are likely to be in Farnham, Godalming, Haslemere, Cranleigh and some of the villages.</p> <p>The policy requires selected release of greenfield land (not Green Belt, AONB or AGLV) which will have a small adverse impact on biodiversity, soils and landscape.</p> <p>The revocation of the RS effectively removes the constraint on potential development in Guildford, Mole Valley and Tandridge which could have a further adverse impact on biodiversity, soils and landscape.</p> <p>The Core Strategy for Waverley is in draft form and the final policy on housing provision remains unconfirmed. This leads to uncertainty and may delay investment. The effect of this would be to delay positive benefit to the population, and any adverse impacts associated with development.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and protection of the natural environment</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary	
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L		
	Yellow			Yellow		Light Green	Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow				<p>Uncertainty Adoption of Waverley Core Strategy. Possibility of housing development in Guildford, Mole Valley and Tandridge.</p>

RS Policy AOSR5: Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy allocates 13,200 dwelling in the remainder of East and West Sussex within the plan period.</p> <p>Provision of new housing would have a significant beneficial impact on the population.</p> <p>Land take incurred through development will have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p> <p>The development required to ensure the housing provision will involve use of construction materials which will have an adverse impact on material assets. It is probable that the development would also increase traffic movements which would increase emissions to air and have a negative impact on air quality and climate. The additional development would also have a negative impact on water resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for more houses. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities in order to achieve this objective. Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it will have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur, dependent on the status of local plans.</p> <p>The Core Strategies for Chichester, Wealden and Rother Districts are in preparation/undergoing consultation. Lewes has an Emerging Core Strategy which has reviewed the housing target set in the South East Plan. This initial target was for 3,400 in the Sussex Coast sub region and 1,000 in the remainder of the district, with an annual supply of 220. The annual target has been reduced to 208, although some flexibility in provision between the Sussex Coast sub region and remaining area is advocated. The Horsham Core Strategy was adopted in February 2007 and the evolving SE Plan, including housing targets, was an important consideration. The Horsham Core Strategy is under review in order to address housing supply in the district. The Mid Sussex district plan (consultation draft) makes provision for new housing outside the former Gatwick sub region but wants the locations of this supply to be determined through Neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The majority of plans are undergoing consultation and therefore previously agreed strategies for housing provision may change. This leads to uncertainty regarding scale and timing. It is assumed that the scale will be similar, but that the locations may differ. Uncertainty could delay development in the short to medium term which would also delay the significant positive impact on health and population, and leaves uncertainty regarding the timing of negative, development related, impacts on biodiversity, soil, water, air, climate, material assets and landscape.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary	
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L		
	Yellow			Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow				<p>Assumptions None</p> <p>Uncertainty Scale and location of development and resulting impacts (see above).</p>

RS Policy AOSR6: Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy sets housing and employment targets for the areas of Kent outside the London Fringe and the Thames Gateway. The total housing provision is 28,000 dwellings, the majority of which are located in Maidstone, Tonbridge and Malling. Tunbridge Wells, Sevenoaks, Medway and Ashford.</p> <p>Provision of new housing would have a significant beneficial impact on the population.</p> <p>Land take incurred through development will have a negative impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p> <p>The development required to ensure the housing provision will involve use of construction materials which will have an adverse impact on material assets. It is probable that the development would also increase traffic movements which would increase emissions to air and have a negative impact on air quality and climate. The additional development would also have a negative impact on water resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Economic conditions support this level of 'new build'.</p>
Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for more housing. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities in order to achieve this objective.</p> <p>With the exception of Medway, the five districts with significant housing provision (Maidstone, Tonbridge and Malling, Tunbridge Wells, Sevenoaks and Ashford) have adopted Core Strategies prepared in the context of the South East Plan, or the emerging plan. The Medway submission draft Core Strategy has been agreed and is undergoing examination. The provision in Medway is 815, of which 785 are in the Thames Gateway, with the remaining 30 being elsewhere in the district. The housing provisions within these plans are of a similar order to those in the policy. As the majority of these plans have been adopted this reduces the level of uncertainty regarding scale and location and the rate of development is expected to be similar to that within the policy.</p> <p>The environmental effects associated with retention would also be likely following revocation.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies within adopted Core Strategies which support sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None.</p>

RS Policy AOSR7: Maidstone Hub

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary		
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy prescribes the role of the local development framework for Maidstone with emphasis on its growth and sub-regional role. The proposals include provision for new employment with emphasis on higher quality jobs, and a focus on expansion and investment in new further or higher education. Infrastructure support includes the South East Maidstone Relief road. The plan should seek to avoid coalescence between Maidstone and the Medway Towns conurbation.</p> <p>Employment and housing growth in the area, combined with greater economic growth, will have a significant positive impact on population.</p> <p>The construction associated with this growth, including infrastructure support, will require construction materials and have an adverse impact on material assets. In addition growth will put pressure on water resources and will have an adverse impact on water.</p> <p>There will be additional land required for housing and infrastructure which will have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape.</p> <p>The policy supports provision of associated transport infrastructure, including the Maidstone Relief Route. It is probable that growth will lead to greater use of private transport although provision of a relief route would improve air quality within the town. The net impact on air quality and climate is uncertain.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															natural environment <u>Assumptions</u> None <u>Uncertainty</u> Net impact on air quality and climate (see above).
Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	-	0	0	+	0	0	-	<u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u> Revocation of the policy will not remove the need for growth in Maidstone. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing. Section 6 of the NPPF (paragraphs 47 – 55) sets out the actions for local authorities in order to achieve this objective. Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the range of benefits and impacts that will occur from meeting that need; however, it may have an effect on when the benefits and impacts are likely to occur. The Maidstone Core Strategy is in draft form and has been developed taking into consideration the RS policies for Maidstone. It generally conforms with the aspirations for the town to be a sub-regional hub and provides further details on delivery. Policy CS1 (Borough Wide Strategy) makes provision for 10,080 houses to be delivered in the plan period with development focused within and next to the urban area. Approved greenfield sites are to be located at the edges of Rural Service Centres. The rural character of the borough is to be protected by avoiding coalescence between settlements including the Medway Towns. Infrastructure is to be provided in a timely way. The housing provision within the policy is marginally lower than in the South East Plan (10,080 as opposed to 11,080) but there is a requirement for some green field development which will have an adverse effect on biodiversity, soil and landscape. Proposed regeneration of the town centre quarters will have a positive impact on townscape and cultural heritage. Further to public consultation, and publication of the NPPF, the Council is considering changes to the Core Strategy including relating to the potential provision of strategic			

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Light Green	Light Green	Dark Green	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	White	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Yellow	Light Green	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	<p>development sites. The draft document is due to go to Cabinet in July and through a further stage of consultation in August/September 2012.</p> <p>The council has a duty to co-operate with other bodies on strategic issues which cross administrative boundaries, and these would include the issues of coalescence of development with neighbouring conurbations.</p> <p>Until the Local Development Plan is adopted there remains uncertainty regarding the detail of allocations for housing, although the probability is that the numbers will remain lower than provided for in the RS, and the extent to which development could extend towards the Medway Towns. However, the Core Strategy to date is advanced in thinking and has undergone several stages of consultation. It is unlikely that the principles established would alter significantly, although there remains uncertainty and this may delay investment. The effect of this would be to delay the significant positive benefit to the population, and any adverse impacts associated with development.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the NPPF relating to sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Final policies in the Core Strategy when adopted.</p>

RS Policy AOSR8: Tonbridge/Tunbridge Wells Hub

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy sets out the LDF requirements for Tonbridge and Tunbridge Wells in the context of their role as a regional hub in which the complementary roles are as a significant economic and service centre (Tunbridge Wells) and as a major transport interchange (Tonbridge).</p> <p>Development is to balance business, commercial and residential development, and to improve links between the centres. Priority is to be given to conservation of the urban and natural environment at Tunbridge Wells, while development in Tonbridge is to concentrate on development of regeneration sites in the centre. The focus on enhanced conservation, combined with regeneration of potentially contaminated brown field sites would have a positive impact on biodiversity, soils and landscape/townscape. However these positive impacts may be offset by the effects of land take for infrastructure provision (see below).</p> <p>The development proposed is to include a higher proportion of key worker and shared equity housing. The combination of enhanced economic development, and the provision of affordable housing for key workers, will have a significant positive impact on the population.</p> <p>New infrastructure is to include improvements to links with East Sussex, Crawley/Gatwick and Maidstone. This would contribute to regional economic benefits. Construction of this infrastructure, combined with the new development, would require construction materials which would have an adverse impact on material assets. The infrastructure may also involve land take which could have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape, and offset the benefits achieved by other parts of the policy. The net effect on biodiversity, soil and landscape is uncertain.</p> <p>Increased infrastructure which serves a strategic regional purpose is likely to lead to an increase in traffic and associated emissions to air which would have an adverse impact on air quality and climate. However, this would be partially offset by benefits gained from reduced</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>travel by key workers living close to employment and so in the long term whilst likely to be negative it is assessed as uncertain (as it could be continue to be neutral or could, if traffic growth returned to trends of previous decades could lead to significant negative effects associated with vehicle emissions).</p> <p>Higher development in the area would place greater pressure on water resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies throughout the plan relating to sustainable development (CC1) and protection of the natural environment</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The principal area of uncertainty relates to the extent of infrastructure provision, and the consequential negative effects on biodiversity, soils and landscape, when compared with the positive impacts on these environmental aspects derived from improvements to the natural environment and regeneration of brown field sites.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	-	-	0	-	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The Tunbridge Wells Core Strategy was adopted in June 2010 and provides for 6,000 dwellings in the borough within the plan period 2006-2026. This strategy was under review but the council took a decision in March 2012 to implement the adopted Core Strategy and stop the review in order to focus effort on site allocation plans. Priority is given in the Core Strategy to development of brown field sites. The Core Strategy was based on the South East Plan and the policies accord with the overall objectives of the RS.</p> <p>The Tonbridge and Malling Core Strategy was adopted in September 2007 and the Development Land Allocation supporting the strategy was adopted in April 2008. The Core Strategy was prepared in general conformity with the evolving SE plan and makes provision</p>			

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>for allocation of 6,375 dwellings within the plan period to 2021 (as against RS target of 8,500 dwellings to 2026). These are to be focused on brown field land. Policy CP26 requires that land required for implementation of County/Government approved transport schemes should be safeguarded from prejudicial development. In an effort to increase affordable housing provision policy CP17 requires 40% provision in any scheme above certain limits.</p> <p>Both authorities are working to adopted strategies which were developed in conformity with the South East Plan, and are seeking to enable development allocations. The strategic requirement for infrastructure provision, in line with the regional hub status, is supported by Tonbridge and Malling policy CP26.</p> <p>With respect to economic development, the South East LEP has a significant role to play in strategic delivery and skills, and local authorities have a duty to co-operate with other bodies, including LEPs, on strategic policies which cross administrative boundaries.</p> <p>Development in the boroughs will be focused in a similar way to that envisage by the RS and will be unaffected by its revocation.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Policies within adopted Core Strategies which support sustainable development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The principal area of uncertainty relates to the extent of infrastructure provision, and the consequential negative effects on biodiversity, soils and landscape, when compared with the positive impacts on these environmental aspects derived from improvements to the natural environment and regeneration of brown field sites.</p>

RS Policy IMR1: Monitoring the RSS

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy requires the regional planning body to assess annually and report on progress towards achieving the objectives of the Plans' policies and sub-regional strategies. Particular focus is to be on: housing; economic growth; management of the region's natural resources' delivery of social, physical and environmental infrastructure and action taken to maintain and enhance the effectiveness of delivery.</p> <p>This monitoring programme, which includes impact on natural resources, will provide a basis for managing and, where necessary, reviewing the South East Plan. Review of the Plan will help to optimise economic development which will, in turn, have a positive impact on population. Review of environmental aspects will be a basis for reducing adverse impacts with a consequential positive effect.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Monitoring is successful in providing basis for optimising policies to promote economic development while reducing environmental impact.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>This policy calls for the regional planning body to produce an annual monitoring report.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of South East Regional Strategy

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic factors			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			Commentary			
	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L				
																															<p>Following the loss of this body the policy is no longer deliverable, although the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011) still requires annual monitoring by local authorities. Revocation of this policy would therefore have no effect.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Monitoring is successful in providing basis for optimising policies to promote economic development while reducing environmental impact.</p>